# RELIGION AND REASON

Mutually correſponding and aſſiſting each other.

## *FIRST ESSAY.*

A Reply to the vindicative Anſwer lately publiſht againſt a Letter, in which the ſence of a Bull and Council concerning the duration of Purgatory, was diſcuſt.

By *Thomas White* Gent.

Vinc. Lir. cap 27.

Intelligatur *te exponere illuſtrius, quod antè obſcurius* credebatur. *Per te Poſteritas* intellectum *gratuletur, quod ante Vetuſtas* non intellectum *venerabatur. Eadem tamen quæ didiciſti ita doce, ut cum dicas novè, non dicas novè.*

PARIS MCIↃLX.

# THE AUTHOR TO THE JUDICIOUS READER.

# THE AUTHOR TO THE JUDICIOUS READER.

I *Suppose you have perus'd the Book I here pretend to Answer*; *And, how do you like it? has he done his work? I dare not say,* demonstrated, *for sure he will not offer at what he thinks impossible; but has he* prov'd, *which is a modest word, and he must not be offended at it? has he solidly prov'd, That* the position he sustains is a Truth traditionarily deliver'd from the Apostles to us as a

point of Catholick Faith? *Or, secondly, That* It is Defin'd either in the Bull or Council? *if he had done this, I should heartily rejoyce in his Victory, though over my self: But if, as to the first branch, he have onely prov'd it the common perswasion of later Ages; and that, without clearing in what quality it is held, whether as Faith or Opinion, even by the Moderns: If, instead of the Consent of Fathers he bring but One, above Exception, and out of that One, the first and chief testimony is indifferent both to him and me, and the onely difficulty of the rest objected and answer'd by my self, and unreply'd to by him: If, of the three passages he cites out of the publick Liturgyes, one onely bear any shew of difficulty; the other two being either plainly neutral or grosly abus'd: And, if in the second branch, he have onely prov'd that it was* suppos'd, or, *as their Title-page warily calls it,* Contain'd *in the Bull and Council, and not* Determin'd, *I cannot see my case so desperate as he imagins. Scripture it*

*self*

*selfe oftentimes proceeding upon Suppositions conformable to the fore-entertain'd apprehensions of those it speaks to, without engaging that every such supposition is a reveal'd Truth. But, on the other side, if I have plentifully alledg'd both Scriptures and Fathers, and Liturgyes, and Reasons too (of which me thinks a little does well even among Divines) and to none of these has he given the least satisfactory answer; I cannot see but my case is hopefull; and when you have read this little Treatise, I cannot doubt but you will see it so too.*

*But all this engages onely a* particular *Controversy, the next is of a far more high and universal importance, of a far different strain from other single and ordinary Questions. For in this, we agree that what the Church sayes is the truth: we agree in the words wherein the Church delivers us that truth; our onely dispute is about the sense of those words; or rather what ought to be the means to come to the knowledge of that sence. We find by day-*

by experience, the same Creed recited in the mouths of children, of men, and of the learned: We cannot doubt but the apprehensions of children and men are different, and that our young thoughts are to be corrected by Age: but whether the Learned and the Prudential make the same apprehensions, is the great Controversy between us. My Antagonist seeing the largest part of the Church consist of this degree of Prudential men, perswades himself, that not only their Belief, but their very apprehensions are uncontrollable and unamendable: I conceive, God has given that priviledg to Learning, to make us understand the truth of our Faith better, then by vulgar and popular conceptions. On my side stand the endeavours of the whole Schools, whose direct Profession it is, to explicate and declare the true sence of Scripture, and the words in which Faith it left us. On his side stands the multitude of the common People, whose fancyes are not elevated, nor their judgments improved by Study: this Multitude he loud-

*ly calls the Church, All Christianity, and such brave names: but be not astonished at his great words, for he distinguishes not between the Church, and the weaker part of it which he follows: nor offended at me that I observe not a grave and regular Progresse, where I am set to catch a bird that hops up and down from twig to twig, chirps upon this a little, and then flyes immediately to another; but rather pity the condition of an old clumsy man too slow and heavy for so wild a Chase. Wherein, yet, by the help of God, I am resolv'd to follow him, as fast as I can. As the whole Book in a manner is made up of little else but* boutades *and flashes, so you are onely to expect from me short hints of what might be said more dilatedly, which I hope may suffice to counterblast those sudden gusts. If any other, as is threatend, come out with stronger Ordnance, I shall endeavour to oppose stronger Bulwarks. I hope he will write hereafter more closely and with less distemper; especially, since now, as I un-*

*derstand, he intends to read my Books; I would be had done so before, he had written against them; for then I might have hop'd a few hours would have sufficed to make my Answer, which now has cost me all my spare time of a whole fortnight.*

*Tho. White.*

INDEX.

# INDEX.


EVery Act (even a sinful one) has some perfection, as to what is positive in it, pag. 132.

That Affections got here are not distinct from the Soul, no singular Opinion, p. 131, 132.

Antiquity not favouring anti-judiciary Delivery, shown from the miscarriage of his best Testimonies thereto, p. 105, 106, 107.

Arraignment of the Author feebly attempted, p. 90, 91, 92.

C.

CEnsuring of Doctrins, and who may lawfully do it, p. 6, 7, 8.

Controversy,

*Controversy, in what manner to be handled,* p. 5, 6.

*Corporall Affections remain after separation,* p. 138, 139, 141, 142, 143.

*Best Corporall pleasures most condemnative to Beatitude,* from p. 133. to p. 137.

*The Councill of Florence, examined,* p. 49.

*Is (with the Bull) strongly defended on by his eminently learned Divine,* p. 53. *not holding ante-judiciary Delivery a material point, nor of Faith,* p. 58, 59, 60, 61.

*Councils, how held by the Author, how by some other Divines,* p. 64, 65, 66. *Infallible in things necessary, and proceeding advisedly,* p. 68, 69. *Their Errability, speaking in common, and abstractedly from all matters and manners of proceeding, held by all,* p. 121, 122, 123. *Fewer, easier, and less discernable requisites to their Infallibility in the Authors Doctrin than in others,* p. 71, 121, 123.

*The Councill of Trents Doctrin concerning Remission and Satisfaction exactly observ'd by the Author,* p. 177, 178, 179.

*Definitions*

## D.

*Definitions may proceed upon Suppositions onely probable,* p. 96, 97.

*Delivery so speedily expected by Privileg'd Altars, diminishing the care of assisting our dead Friends,* p. 88, 89. *and our amendment here,* p. 184, 185. *The opinion of ante-judiciary Delivery never taught as certain,* p. 83, 84, 87. *Its beginning and progress,* p. 77. to 81.

*True Discourse in Angels following from the Vindicators tenet,* p. 162, 163.

*Distinguishers between Faith and Opinion must neither be illiterate nor meanly learned,* p. 76, 84, 85, 87.

*Divinity grafted on the stock of our naturall speech; and, so, on Philosophy,* p. 24.

## E.

*Eymericus his mistake,* p. 47, 48. *His censoriousness* p. 39, 40.

## F.

*Faith not endanger'd by true Science,* p. 12, 13. *but its objects better understood by*

by it p. 9, 10, 14, 15. not diversify'd according to the several Apprehensions of the Faithfull, p. 9, 10, 11. 14. 191. 198. 199.
Their False-dealings and disingenuities touch'd at, p. 22, 23. 27, 28. 31. 48, 49, 50, 52, 61. 93, 94. 112, 113, 115, 120, 121, 125, 126, 174.
Father and Son spoken of God metaphorically, 102, 103, 104.
That Foundations contradict unto judiciary Delivery, p. 79.

G.

THat a Governour dispossest ought to be restor'd when the common Good requires it, the profest and express Doctrin of the Author, p. 116.
S. Gregory was the Author of those Dialogues which gave us the first hint of an anti-judiciary Delivery, p. 77, 78. Hence, the origin of that Opinion much later, p. 107.

I.

IDentification of the Soul and Body necessary for a Body's action on her, p. 153. 155.

*Identity of the Soul and Body*, p. 154, 155.
*Infallibility*, when certainly founded in decrees of a Pope and Council, p. 172, 173.
*Inquest* not necessary to find out *Faith*, p. 73.
*Interpretation of the Bull and Council by the Vindicator*, manifoldly defective, p. 75.

M

*THe Method of a Divine in seeking Truth*, p. 8, 14.
*Diverse Mistakes about the Council of Florence*, p. 92, 93. *of a Censure*, p. 16, 17. *of the occasion of my writing the Middle State*, p. 28, 29. *of a Metaphor*, p. 191. *of the Liturgies manifoldly*, p. 109, 110. *of my Doctrin concerning a dispossest Governour*, p. 116. *and the Uncertainty of Scriptures letter*, 110, 117, 118. *of best corporall pleasures*, p. 134. *of eternall Happiness to be no Good at all*, p. 166, 167. *of the Souls nature at reunion*, p. 183.
*Mysteries of Faith not knowable without Revelation*, p. 11.

*Plagiarisme*

P

*Paganism uncharitably and weakly objected,* p. 187.
*Pains of Purgatory what, in the true opinion of the Author,* p. 144.
*Prayers and Alms for the Dead in use before the Opinion of ante-judiciary Delivery,* p. 78, 79. *and many wayes beneficiall to them in the Authors Doctrin,* p. 167. *to* 173.
*A Prohibition of a Book no Censure,* p. 16. *to* p. 20.
*Punishments of pure Spirits agreed by all to to be Acts of the Will,* p. 88.

Q.

*THE Question stated as in the Bull,* p. 34.

S.

*Scriptures Letter uncertain without the ayd of Tradition,* p. 117.
*The Soul, how substantially chang'd by separation, yet the same,* p. 139, 140.
*Pure Spirits know all things together and perpetu-*

*perpetually*, p. 156. to p. 161.
*The Sufferings of our Saviour not prejudic'd by the unyeldingness of separated Souls to externall torments*, p. 146, 147.

T

*Tradition not examinable*, p. 72. *More or less Time exercising adds or diminishes nothing to a pure Spirit*, p. 149. to 153.

## *Errata.*

P. 114 *l.* 19, 20. *these terms; but the* Terms *expressing those Mysteries, which were*—*p.* 147. *l.* 9. *conform. p.* 157. *l.* 12. *appetit.*

# RELIGION AND REASON.

## *First Essay.*

### Introduction.

SIR,

*HAD your Answer to the unknown Author been written in my fresher dayes, I should have endeavour'd to have given you an ampler satisfaction: Now, being come forth in my frozen Age, when my long ague hath made me fitter to think of death than of School-*

*quarrels, I hope you will be patient with me, if, in as short a method as I can, I give you rather hints by which a little endeavour of your own may find out satisfaction, than dilate my self so far that every weak eye may see it.*

Doctor Hammond, *as I am told, about the same time hath bent himself against my Doctrine: whom, though I much esteem, being assured by friends common to us both that he is a very courteous and civill person, and hath spent much time in reading good Authours; yet have I rather preferd the answering you; both because I expect better quarter at your hands, since the stricter bond of Religion should make us apt to interpret one another more fairly; as also, and indeed far more (for I see that Tye very slippery in many) because you have some tincture of the School; and, to my thinking, are much sharper and abler to set off an argument, and write a style solid and proper to the matter: Whereas, that loose way of preaching and affectation of words the*

Doctor

*Doctor uſes, ſhews more vanity then ſubſtance in his Diſcourſes. Beſides he has an Adverſary from ſatisfying whom he ſeems to me very ſhort; and I am gladly willing to excuſe my pains when I ſee the ſame or more fruit come from anothers Pen.*

*Returning then to you, I hold it my firſt duty to give you many thanks for your work; you being the firſt, who (though ſomewhat late for me, now ſcarce able to keep my ſelf warm by a fire) have given me the occaſion to ſpeak for my ſelf, that the world may ſee whether thoſe many ſmother'd ſlanders, which ſo long have layen heavy on me and my works, bear a value proportionable to the noyſe they have made. Which to examin in ſhort, I divide your Treatiſe (and ſo, my Reply) into two Parts: the firſt holding twenty two of your Sections, and belonging chiefly to the* Middle State of Souls: *the ſecond, containing the reſt of your Sections, touching upon many points of my Doctrin in which you find fault.*

# FIRST PART.

*Refuting some of the Vindicators Objections, as they ly in his Book; chiefly those that concern the Middle State.*

---

## FIRST DIVISION
## Containing an Answer to his five first Sections.

*The Vindicator's mistake of the manner of treating Controversies, and of the nature of a Censure. The Method a knowing Divine ought to pursue. Diverse Errors rectify'd.*

TO begin then with your first Section, I confess you speak very fairly, had your patience but held out, not to have broke your word in that very Section: which I intend presently

ly to declare, if first I desire you to beware how you take principles out of Heretick's mouths. The Nobleman out of whom you cite the Maxim that *writing of Controversies ought to carry as much sweetnesse as Love-letters*, was a very ingenious and worthy Person; but, if you enquire of his Religion you shall find it in *Chillingworths* book, in which he is thought to have had a great hand. And Mr *Chillingworths* Religion how sound it was you may ghess out of the answers made by himself to himself which go before his book. In one whereof he candidly professes, that if to morrow he sees more reason for another Religion, and next day for a third, he will change his Religion as often.

Now, who can doubt but he that has his Religion tackt on him with such slight pins that he may change it *a la mode*, has reason neither to take offence nor give any upon that account, but civilly to proceed with a gentile and unengag'd indifferency as in a business that concerns him not enough to be angry about: And, if you have such an esteem of your Religion, you shall do very well to follow that Maxim: But, if you conceit writing in Religion to be one of the most efficacious courses to

breed an eternall and incomparable mischief to the readers, if it be so handled that he may think both sides (as men call it) *probable*, and that it sinks into neithers heart, then I believe your pen will prove sharp and stinging, as wee see the Fathers is in such occasions; though some milk and honey towards the Persons bee mingled for Charity and Edifications sake.

Now let me perform my promise. You say you *cannot digest their boldnes who usurp the Authority of the supreame tribunal to brand any opinion with the title of Heresy whilest the Church has not done it to their hands.* Yet presently after you do it your self, branding this opinion of Purgatory as *Heretical*, and bringing your Evidence that you *are convinc't it is condemned.*

And, I pray, who offers to *censure* another, but he takes himself to bee *convinc't* that it is against some Rule which he supposes sufficient to make a Catholick Truth; as, against Scripture, Councils, the generality of the Fathers, or (as you do) against the Definition of a Pope; and this to him is a Conviction that it is *Condemned* before he censures it. Not have you any more to build on than your own Perswasion that it is defin'd; your self professing that *the*

*Question*

*Question is brought to those niceties that one need have his Understanding perfectly calm to judge of it.* So that, on your *perfectly calm judgment* entirely relies this your *censure.* Thus much to your self: But, as to the universall proposition of censuring opinions, you seem a great stranger in the world. For, what famous Divine, what University, what Bishop is not thought fit to censure a malignant proposition? Is there not regularly in all Dioceses some *Censor Librorum* expresly appointed? Is not every Preacher subject to be forbidden the Chair if he advance a proposition that the Bishops Theologall thinks not fit to be suffer'd? Are you ignorant of the pudder at *Paris* about censuring *Monsieur Arnaulds* letters, which censure was not approved at *Rome*? And yet you *cannot digest their boldness who usurp the Authority of the supreme Tribunal to brand any opinion with the title of Heresy while the Church has not done it to their hands.* Know, great Divine, that the Pastor or Doctor who lets a wicked proposition run uncontroll'd among the people till means bee made to get it censur'd and forbidden in *Rome* (which how hard it is if the maintainer have great Friends may appear by the long contest

betwixt the order of *Saint Dominick* and the *Jesuits* about certain propositions of *Molina*) wrongs his own conscience and is unfaithfull to his vocation, in suffering the infection to sink deeply into the hearts of the Faithfull ere he prepare an Antidote. Besides, when would the Pope take notice of what is publisht in *France* or *England* if no body cry *Fire*? How many, how violent out-cryes were there in *France* before the *Jesuits* wicked cases were condemn'd at *Rome*. So that this principle of yours betrayes the Church into the hands of any potent Heresy that shall spring in a far Country. Let me therefore intreat you not to use so uncivill terms towards all the learned Doctors of the Church.

I hope you will not be offended that I omit to answer some small shot of yours in this Section, that I may pass to the next; in which I find my self taxed of a wrong Method in seeking Truth, out of a story which as I do not particularly remember, so am I far from denying; for the Method you report, as I understand you, is truly mine; that is, as a Divine, to *find out the Truths in Philosophy, and then the Mysteries of our Faith will square well enough with them*; and so I doubt not but I have been

subject

subject to declare is many times. Nor can I conjecture who it was that gave mee the Answer you mention, but shrewdly ghess that he either did not understand mee, or the matter, or both. And because by your proceeding I fear you are in the same Error, I will endeavour to explicate my sentiments, and leave the judgment of the cause to upright Understanders. My conceit of matters of Faith is that the Scriptures and Creeds and sometimes also our Doctors deliver them in *words* well known, but whose *vulgar sence* Divines see impossible to bee true. For example, where it is sung that *the Eternall Son descended from Heaven*, the vulgar conceive a locall motion by which he came down into the B. Virgins womb; and, as I remember, I saw it painted thus at *Frankford* in a Catholick Church whither I went to Mass: The Holy Ghost above coming towards the Virgin, and sending rayes before it in which was a little child carry'd by them towards that Blessed Mother: An apprehension which the learned know to bee impossible. So, by our expression of *Christ's sitting at the right hand of his father*, what doth a vulgar hearer imagin but an old man sitting in an high chair, and his young Son in another, set

at

at his right hand. I cannot believe you think it possible this meaning should be literally true. To find out then the true sense, I conceive Philosophy a fitting instrument; So that by Philosophy we come thus to *understand* our Faith, and by understanding it, to be able both to defend it and propagate science out of it. A certain sort of Divines (if I wrong them not in calling them so) there is, who, conceiting as soon as they have the *words* they know the *meaning*, reckon not upon this way; but cast about to find out more and other words that shall lead them to the defence and propagation of the known truths; and think they must not look what Philosophy sayes, but teach her what she ought to say. This I conceive to have been the difference between me and the eminent Schollar that conferr'd with me.

When I had read thus far, I expected to see the other Method strongly maintain'd, & mine as strongly laid flat on the ground; but, looking farther I onely find your own *censure*, and that such a one as is hard to judge whether it be a dispraise or a commendation: But, whatsoever it is, with mistake or addition. From which last to begin, you suppose I intend out of Philoso-

phy

phy to frame a Divinity, and, if I understand you right, *independently from Revelation*; which I am sure you can find neither in my words nor my writings, but onely that revealed propositions were to be explicated by Philosophical ones known without Revelation. Do you make no difference between inventing Divinity-truths and finding out the Meanings of the Words in which they are deliver'd? Do not Lawyers dispute the meaning of the Laws after they set the Words by before them? Do Scripturists invent Scriptures when they seek out the sence hidden in those writings? I pray then take notice that you either add to or mistake what I say; for, how often do I expresly affirm those Mysteries could not be known without Revelation, though, after they are revealed, they may by nature be explicated, and new truths propagated out of them. You seem to be too much afraid that my Method should bring forth *unnaturall and new Divinity*. Had you said *a supernaturall* one, I could not have desir'd a greater praise at your hands; for to all supernaturall Qualities, at least the good ones, are term'd by Divines. But you say *a naturall one*: what mean you by this term? That

it

it shall be one never reveal'd by God, and yet expreſt by the very words in which God reveal'd his? Truly, if this be your meaning, I am beholding to you for a great honour and commendation. But I muſt tell you I ſuſpect you underſtand not well your own propoſition. For, if it be true that the Holy Ghoſt means in his words all true ſenſes which they afford, there is no denying but ſuch a Divinity will be a *revealed* one, however it may be proved by naturall Principles; For, you will not deny but the ſame object ſometimes may be knowable both by Faith and by Philoſophy. If the Divinity you mean be falſe, it is either againſt the other which you ſay is *revealed*, or againſt naturall Principles: This latter you cannot preſs while you grant it is a *naturall* one, that is, according to naturall Principles. The former leaves ſtill this quarrell undecided which is the true Divinity, ſince the words bear both the ſenſes; and, this, by your own ples, hath the advantage of conformity to nature, as indeed any true Divinity muſt have. Beſides, the *novelty* you fear, ſuppoſing it contradict no truth already known, is a great praiſe; for to diſcover new Truths eſpecially in Divinity, and ſuch

as

as are of moment, is to advance and give a Progress to that sacred Science, and so the highest pitch a Divine can aym at.

Thus much being spoken to your *fearfull* thoughts, let me consider the two sayings, that of your *eminent Schollar*, and mine own. I desir'd to be *assured of naturall Truths*, and said (as your self report) that *the mysteries of Faith would square well enough with them*. And I appeal to your self whether I spoke Truth or no. If I mistake not your Person you have been a Reader of Philosophy, and so cannot be ignorant that *ex veris non sequitur falsum*, and that *Verum vero minime contradicit*. If then we have once certainly found the Truths of Philosophy, can there be any danger that what we have so found should contradict our Mysteries? Much help may proceed out of such Principles, much direction; no harm, no danger of erring. So that I doubt not but your self, if you consider it, will find this resolution perfectly secure.

Now let us turn the leaf and examin the course of *your eminent Schollar*; and you may easily descry how he commands us to take *unknown* Principles to prove Truths which may be known by other plain

plain wayes. Do not mistake me, I call not the Principles of Faith *unknown* as *not* being *demonstrated*, but as *but* being *understood*. I grant the Letter to be certain and certainly known, I grant a *quadam tenus* of the sence to be known, but the sence which in rigour is literally verifiable, that I do not grant to be alwayes and entirely known out of the pure force of Faith. Your self will easily apply this Doctrin to the Article of our Saviours *sitting at the right hand of his Father*. It is certainly known those words are true; it is certainly known the materiall sence which the vulgar takes has a proportion to the true sence: For, the true sence being that he arrived to perfect Quiet after the troublesome œconomy he had passed in this world, which Rest hath *sitting* for its concomitant in an active man; That he remain'd the first and chiefest Instrument, and in the French phrase, *le premier Ministre d' Estat* in Gods Government of the World, to which dignity is annext a kind of perpetuall presence and conference with the Prince: Now, why this is well expresst by *being on the right hand* of another, may we not consult some other skill than that of Faith? Wherefore, in such cases as these I cannot doubt to affirm

affirm that true Philosophy is both an use-full and necessary and alwayes obedient servant of Faith. And let your *eminent Scholler* without the assistance of any other knowledge than the bare words of the Article attempt to determin out of them what *sitting*, and what *on the right hand* is, and this according to the way and profession of a Divine, I fear he will come out with some such notion as others of his form learnedly give to *Person, Nature, Ubi's, Actio's, &c.* that is, some strange puzzling thing, which not onely leaves us altogether ignorant what it is in God, but wholly confounds the knowledge we have of it in Nature.

Neither do I deliver this purely by Discourse but by Experience, which Experience joyntly with my reading *S. Thomas* were the Instruments by which God conducted mee to this way. I thought it fit to dilate my self a little in this point, that you who are in your flourishing age, and hopefull to be a great Light in Gods Church, if you be put in the right way, may by little and little mark the difference of them who go under the common name of Divines, and see how many such as you esteem *eminent Schollars* are onely *Historicall*, not *Scientificall*

*entifical* Divines? They can tell you after the manner of an history or Narrative what the most celebrated Doctors teach, what is in their opinion the more common sentence of Schoolmen; and, the multitude or reputed worth of such Doctors is the scale in which they weigh Theologicall truths; though they read even in those very Doctors that their Authority is of no more value than the proofs they bring. Now, if Divinity be a *Science*, as I am sure you will not deny, it being voiced so by those very Divines, though sleightly executed, there must of necessity be, or be possible a sort of Divines who in true speaking *know* Theologicall Truths, who therefore will properly and with Justice claim the title of *Divines*, whereas these others will be but Discoursers in Theologicall Subjects. If an old mans Experience may prevaile with you, I exhort you to study *true divinity*.

Looking into your third Section, at the very door I met with a scruple which I must endeavour to remove. You say, *The Authority of our Supreme Pastor hath interposed his sharp but justly deserved Censures against diverse of my books.* I confess it is gravely spoken; but I find not any fence within to maintain so peremptory an outside.

I pray

I pray which of your *eminent Scholars* teach that the *prohibition* of a book is a *censure*. The holy Bible if printed I do not say in a vulgar language, but even in an Hereticall Country, especially by an Heretick, is *prohibited*, and your way of speaking which makes a *prohibition* a *Censure*, and a *sharp* one too, would make us beleeve that the Bible, that is, *Gods word* is *sharply censured* by the Pope. Can you imagin a greater scandal, considering the place where you live? In *Luthers* time there was a Decree that whatever Book was printed by any book seller who had printed any of *Luthers* works should be prohibited. Read the *Rules* of the *Index expurgatorius* in the Council of *Trent*, and see how farr wide you have stray'd from the Catholike practice and opinion.

As for the speciall prohibition against my book, though Doctor *Holden* hath learnedly declared the quality of it and that be sufficient, yet I have these two notes to offer you; one, that I am now fortify'd in my plea (which hitherto has been accused as a meer shift to cover my disaffection) that a simple Condemnation of a Book at *Rome*, without singling out any particular proposition, leaves the whole *Doctrin*

of the Book untouch'd. I am confirm'd, I say, now by a fresh Authority out of *Stanbrockius* his new Notes upon *Wendrockius* his Commentaries on the Provinciall Letters; where, at the bottom of the page before the first, you may see how unscrupulously those Children of Obedience take up the same undutifull pretence against Roman Condemnations with others when their case is the same with others. This you may plainly see if you busy not your thoughts too much at the seeming contradiction of my words [*the page before the first*] for I observe your Art is excellent in descanting on a Bull. But, because the words *prohibited*, *condemn'd*, make a noyse a great deal lowder than their signification, I shall so far comply with my Reader's either unexperience or indisposition as to cite that disguis'd Jesuit *Stanbrockius* his words; that the world may know how *Religious men* and those whose chief-strictness consists in *Obedience*, can put by the blow of a Superiour's command when they are concern'd in it, how loudly soever they exclaim against others for a less matter. *Si nihil prorsus in eo (Libro prohibito) sigillatim configatur, sed prohibeatur generatim, nemo sapiens neget eo damnatas*

*saxat nonhine prohibitum fuisse quod contra regulas a Concilio Tridentino præscriptas, editum sit.* *If nothing at all in particular be struck at in that Book, but it be prohibited in generall terms; no wise man can deny but that it was onely in this regard prohibited, because it was set forth against the Rules prescribed by the Councel of Trent*; as that the Authors name was not printed (by which, observe, that this your Book, according to the Council of *Trent Sess.* 4. is *prohibited*) or Approbation of Superiours obtain'd, or such like. And the Book *Stubrockius* thus strives to defend is neither better nor worse than the intolerable Apology for the Casuists, *condemn'd* and *prohibited* by the Pope the last *August*.

My other Note is, that amongst *all* the *two* Books of mine (for your *diverse* are no more) prohibited in *Rome*, this which you except at is none: So that your Censure is the first; how well grounded your following discourse will tell us. The reason that Court would not proceed against it (though the Doctrin it delivers might justly expect a stronger opposition, than some others that have had worse luck, from the Interest of its most zealous Adversaries) is because they see my opinion supported

ported by an Universality of Fathers, of contrasting with whom they are cautious in *Rome*, being persons of great prudence. And the Ex-Jesuit who writ so bitterly against me here in *England*, though solicited to oppose that Book, would not, answering he knew diverse Fathers of that mind, particularly *S. Austin*, whom (sayes he) I have read over no less than fourteen times.

You promise me in the end of this Section *to concern your self onely with this one Controversy of the State of Souls dying in grace not as yet fully purged, and with the positions and grounds on which* (my) *explication of Purgatory stands; unless some one Doctrin* (of mine) *or other, having a neer alliance with the business in hand so offer it self that the Discourse and Subject would be illustrated by it.* You promise me a great favour; for, I naturally love to speak to one question at once, and points connected with it, that so it may be more fully illustrated and the Reader inform'd; which, when many are touch't sleightly and onely catch't at, especially if disparate and not tending to the same difficulty, the Reader's eye is distractedly drawn diverse wayes, and no occasion offerd of clearing any thing

thing fully. But I muſt not be ſo happy as to hope performance from you in any thing. You promiſt me formerly the ſweet ſtyle of *Love-Letters*; but anon very furiouſly and unkindly call me *Arrian*, *Pagan*, *Heathen*, and what not? You promiſt you would not cenſure me; and yet proceed even in the ſame place and all over to cenſure me moſt ſharply. You promiſt *a great ſtrength of ſence* in treating this Subject; but have hitherto afforded me nothing but the contrary weakneſs, and I mainly fear the like performance in the reſt of your Book. You promiſt civility towards my *perſon*, and that you *combated only my Doctrin*; yet more than once quarrell with my very name, which I aſſure you, Sir, is onely *perſonall*, and not a jot *doctrinall*. And now you promiſe me the treating onely one queſtion and points neerly ally'd with it, which is a procedure worthy a Schollar; but yet afterwards you ramble to the *Apocalypſe*, *the two wings of the woman*, *the Eternall Generation of the ſecond perſon*, my expreſſion of my name and quality, and diverſe ſuch diſcourſes; which are not onely *not neerly* but not at all ally'd to the preſent queſtion: Which ſhows that you are very regardleſs of your

word and credit, and unconſtant to your own thoughts; and that you aym more to cavill and make a noiſe againſt me, by picking out of my works two or three Paragraphs here and there from their fellows by connexion with which they ſubſiſted (a method which ſhould one attempt in God's Holy Word it ſelf, your own heart tels you nothing ſo abſurd but might be father'd upon it) rather than to confute any piece end wayes as a Schollar ſhould do.

Your fourth Section (the ſubſtance of it being nothing but the copying another Book) I am glad to have nothing to except againſt, onely you inſinuate a fault in the Tranſlation, which not having the Latine copy by me I cannot judge of. Had you endeavour'd to mend it, you ſhould have oblig'd both the worthy Tranſlatour and my ſelf.

In your fifth Section by a malignant ſleight you ſeek to bite *Sir Kenelm Digby*, ſaying, *the book of the Immortality of the Soul was father'd upon him.* I know you would do me the honour to entitle me to it. But, as that eloquently proper Style, the diffuſion of the Diſcourſe, the multitude of experiences even in Arts wherein I am totally ignorant,

ignorant, do exclude me from the vanity of pretending to so excellent a piece, so do they discover to the world the rashness of your impotent Envy. My part follows next in the subscription of my *Peripateticall Institutions*, the naturall sence whereof being, *Thomas an English man, of the Whites of Essex*, you are pleas'd to transform according to your good will. You add I say *my Institutions are according to the Minde of that most eminent man and excellent Philosopher*. And, as for the first Epithet I have the unanimous Testimony of all that know him and are able to judge in what consists the worth of abilities in the arts both of peace and warr. And, for the second, concur with me all those in *Italy*, *France*, *Germany* and *England*, whom their own industry and æquability of minde have made worthy to read his Book. What your following discourse sayes of my Institutions I candidly confess and am bound to thank you for scaling it with your good word; saving still what you cite out of the *Consilium Authoris*, where is no such matter as you express, though your sincerity can allow the puting it in a different letter as a citation from the place: And, therefore I see even when you make show to cite the very words, the

Reader muſt look the place if he will not be miſtaken. Though you ſeem to ſpeak of a Point which all Peripateticks acknowledge to be done by *Ariſtotle* long ſince, and ſo needs no greater excellency to perform than to have read and underſtood him. It ſeems by your requiring Faith in your Reader, that in your ſchools you do not uſe to let your ſchollars ſee evidence to anchor them in your doctrin, but you propound ſome eaſy and plauſible perſwation to tickle and inveigle their belief; and ſo need none of thoſe ſtrange terms, *fit, ſequitur, conſequens eſt, &c.* for no one thing follows another in your doctrin. All are either *primò nota* or *poſtremò ignota* in your Philoſophy.

Your next quarrell is that I ſay Divinity is *inædificata* to Philoſophy. Lord! how you would have been troubled if I ſhould have ſayd that *Faith* is grafted upon the ſtock of our naturall underſtanding, and Charity on our Will; and yet I beleeve this will prove the tenet of your *eminent Scholiars*. Now, if this be ſo, ſure it is leſs abſurd but not leſs neceſſary that our Divinity be grafted into the ſtock of our naturall Speech and words, whoſe meanings and Definitions Philoſophy muſt open to us. I

pray

pray then be not offended with this word *Inadificata*; for it signifies not *super ædificata*, nor has the force to signify that the strength of Divinity comes from Philosophy, but that Philosophy is the wax into which the seal of Divinity is printed, which no learned ingenuous man will deny. For, if Definitions be the Principles of Science, and Philosophy defines the words Divinity uses, it must needs have a materiall priority to it.

Next, you tell your Reader my Philosophy and Divinity are *so perfectly squar'd, that if I had not made a Division of the Books it had been impossible to know where one ended and the other began.* Honour'd Sir, you know I am but a poor man, and cannot give rewards for good turns done to me; therefore I beseech you to be content with humble thanks: For I owe them from my heart; First to God who gave me to perform what you say or rather did it by me, next, to your self who so kindly acknowledge and divulge it. For I see not how you could give a Schollar a greater praise, than to signify that the contexture of (not his Paragraphs, but) even his Books are so closely connected. But to check my too much feeding on your praises,

praises, you give me a knock with every bit; you say *I baniſh ſupernaturality, evacuate Chriſtian Faith, admit nothing on other grounds than Demonſtration*, all calumnies as falſe as bold, and ſo can do me no harm where your bare word is not blindly believ'd.

## SECOND DIVISION.

### Containing an Anſwer, from Section ſixth, to the fifteenth.

*The Ground-work of the Vindicator's impugnation of the Middle State found to be a moſt groundleſs Calumny. The occaſion of writing the Middle State, the Letter of Vindication, and that in Anſwer to the Diſpenſers of the Bull and Canon. His weakneſs in arguing, in ſtating the Queſtion, and oppoſing his Adverſary.*

IN the ſixth Section you ſeem to come to the Queſtion, and cite a large Text out of my *Peripatetical Inſtitutions*, adding at the end this concluſion of your own. *This*

*is*

*is the Essence, the Substance of his Purgatory, this is his whole chain or deduction of it, this is the grief he admits in separated Souls, &c.* Is it possible, Sir, you should thus forget all truth and honesty? First, you cite out of a Book where there is no more mention nor thought of Purgatory than of the Dungeon of *Constantinople*; where Method permitted me to treat of no more than I had before layd grounds for, where I had not made any mention of Christianity, or Christian Felicity or Unhappiness: Where, in a word, I could onely speak to pure Naturalists; and yet you boldly pronounce *this is the Essence, the Substance of his Purgatory, this is the grief he admits in separated Souls*; whereas the whole business is both in the *Sacred Institutions* and *Middle State* (the Books which purposely treat that Subject) so quite differently and so at large explicated. Pray, Sir, furnish your self and me with some excuse why you omit those Books which designedly handle that matter, and cite out of another which handles it not at all; and then, upon this false and abusive pretence, lay the whole Ground-work of your future impugnation.

The seventh and eighth Sections consist chiefly

chiefly of my words, and so I may omit them till there arise some occasion of farther examination: onely I must note that at the end of your eighth Section you profess your great *care fully to deliver the foundations of my new Fabrick of Purgatory*; yet make no mention at all of the *Institutiones Sueræ*, or that there is either Scripture, or Fathers, or Theologicall reasons alledged in my Book of the *Middle State*; by this sly trick seeking to draw your credulous Reader into the conceit that there is no other ground for my opinion than a Metaphysicall Argument, whose force because they do not penetrate, you may shake it off with crying 'tis non-sence.

In the ninth Section you tell a forged story (whether out of Ignorance or Malice I leave to your conscience) that my Lord of *Chalcedon admonisht me of this point and others*, and that I was ready with a *premeditated Apology*. In which, though short, there ly three mistakes. First, that my Lord *admonisht* me: For, though he were my *Superiour*; though one whom a long-well-spent Age, great study and many writings had made awfull to our Church, yet was he far modester than you, and profest, as he did dislike my opinions, so *he dissented no otherwise*

*otherwise than as one Divine does from another, and had never descended to censure any of them.* Perhaps, of this point you may have heard the contrary, but I have it under his own hand. The second mistake is, that he admonish't me of *this point*; for he never descended to any particular; and this you might understand (as partly the other) out of my Dedicatory of my *Ratio villicationis* written to him, and presented in his lifetime. The third, that I had *fore-prepar'd* my Book of the *Middle State*, and presently sent it him. For, the reason of my composing it was the many popular noises rais'd against me by persons, some ignorant, some malicious, as if I were an Heretick, which forc't me to write the Treatise in mine own defence, and I dedicated it to my Lord, though I knew no particular Exception of his against this point, but judged he might have some, because the greatest cry was against it. The Translation, as far as came to my knowledge, was not made by any design upon earth, though by the event I perceive it was out of speciall Providence in Heaven. How things passed on your side, and what were the true motives of your publishing the Bull, and that Testimony of the Council I can onely collect from

from the *phænomena* of all concurrent circumstances, of which you may perhaps hereafter hear more.

You say *the Publishers of the Bull had no respect to the Letter of Vindication.* I think you aym at one I wrote in Latin to a Person of Honour, which was presented Him, and by him shew'd to some *Jesuits* that frequented his House, and they can be witnesses of the Truth between us. This, afterwards, as I hear, was translated into English and printed. If this be the Letter you speak of, I would gladly understand why you imagin the Author conceits himself *inspir'd with the Genius of Mont-alt*: whose spirit, I confess, I take to be very solid and pious, and generously adhering to persecuted Truth: Nor, do I find it unlawfull that any should wish to be inspir'd with it, but truly conceive my self far below the hope of such Excellences.

What you *heard well observ'd that all the Protestant Divines of England would subscribe to the same Protestation which is in that Letter*, I beleeve purely upon your report. But tell me first, may a Catholick protest nothing that a Protestant will subscribe to? or can a Protestant profess nothing but what he will perform. Again,

will

will any Protestant profess *to renounce any Doctrin found to contradict any Authority constantly acknowledg'd for Infallible in the Catholick Church*, meaning the same by *Catholick Church* as my writings declare me to do, that is all those who adhere to Tradition? Will any Protestant be content to *have lost his cause if any decree of a Pope be expressly repugnant to him*, which I there also profess? How maliciously blind then was the *observer* you follow, who could not see such distinctive expressions? How uncharitable your self who catch at and magnifie every rash cavill, out of a tooth to disgrace and abuse him that never did you injury. Your calumny of my *denying Decrees of Popes and Councils* shall be answer'd in its due place.

You say *the Publishers intended not to enter into the lists of Disputation*, which I easily beleeve; and that they were perswaded, the very reciting the Bull and Canon would have knocke down the Book (which you say was the occasion of their setting them forth) beyond all Reply. How weak a conceit was this for men that saw both Bull and Canon cited and explicated in that very book, and could not be ignorant that in many private Conferences the same Authorities

rities had been debated? You thought your *Capitall Letters* would have dazled the understanding of the adverse party, so that none would have dar'd to look further into the meaning of those Authorities. But God provided that all should not be so *light of belief*, nor his Church led into Error by such a misgrounded Interpretation of its Decrees. You complain much in your tenth Section that this *pious intention of the Dispensers* was wrong'd. As though you did not know that *Intentions* are secret and must expect their reward from him that sees the heart: Men judge of *Actions*, and your self confess the effect was that *pious* (that is, credulous) *persons received satisfaction*; that is, were seduced into Errour by that cuning practice; and yet you think it not occasion enough for an understanding man to discover so prejudiciall an Interpretation forc't on the Church; and would needs have it a wrong to you that one *unknown* & not *intended to be hurt by you* should take this pains; as if every honest and ableman were not interessed in the Churches quarrell of so high a nature as to set up an *Opinion*, that may prove when examin'd *erroneous*, for an *Article of Faith*.

In your eleventh Section you begin to produce

produce your Arguments, whereof the first is, that *all Orthodox writers who have treated this Subject of the State of separated Souls since the promulgation of the Bull aforesaid suppose it as a certain Truth.* But how many such do you cite? Surely of five hundred which have written since those dayes your Readers might civilly expect at least half a score that positively assert it as an assur'd doctrin of the Church. But, such is the irregular way of discourfing your *eminent Scholars* use, that when they have audaciously advanc'd a proposition whereof they know nothing certain, if it be deny'd, against all Rules of Discourse and Logick they put the Defendant to prove the contrary, which peradventure concerns not him a pin whether it be true or no. As in the present, what concerns it my Faith whether many or few interpret the Bull and Councill as you or I say? To make a new Article of Faith the definition must be so clear that none can doubt of it: And *ipso facto* that it needs Interpretation, 'tis evidently insufficient to make a new obligation of Faith. Again, suppose your Antecedent be true, does any number of Interpreters lock up the understandings of those that follow that they

may not see more than their Fore-goers? If you say *yes*; shew us some seal of Infallibility in their foreheads by which we may know so much, or else your Faith will be but probable; but *peradventure I, peradventure no*; and Interest or Passion must supply the rest. And, such I believe is your Faith of this your new-born *Article*, though somewhat an older *Opinion*.

In your twelfth Section you enquire into the state of the Question; and when you have recited it out of the Bul, you presently cry, *Victory*, without ever looking into the words and sence; that one may note in you the wonted disposition of your great Masters, to read the words, but seldom take pains to understand them. The Bull then sayes, that in the dayes of the Popes Predecessor *there rose a Question among Divines concerning the vision of the Souls of just men after their death, in which nothing was to be purg'd when they departed out of this world, or, if there were, it was now totally purg'd; whether they see the Divine Essence before the re-assumption of their bodies, and the General Judgment, and also concerning other matters, &c.* I pray you now, in vertue of your Logick, shew us here what is the *subject*

*ject* of the Question, what the *Predicate*. To my apprehension the *Subject* is divided into two parts; one is of *Just men in whom at their death nothing is to be purg'd*; the other of them *who at their death had somewhat to be purg'd, but now are totally purg'd*: The *Predicate* is, the *seeing of God's Essence before the day of Judgment*. If this be so, then resolve me whether the *Subject* of the Proposition be affirm'd by the Proposition, or be that of which the *Predicate* is affirm'd. We whose Logick tends to Demonstration, agree that the *Subject* is not affirm'd, but is that of which the *Predicate* is affirm'd? What your *eminent Scholar's* that square Philosophy and consequently Logick to their not understood Faith, will say to this, I expect you to teach us who are a great Professour (I doubt not) in their way. In the mean while give me leave to think and tell you, that the Question whether *any Souls be purg'd before the re-assumption of their bodies*, is no part of the Popes Answer, and neither part of the *Predicate* nor of the *Copula*; and this so evidently that no ingenuous person can reply upon it; which I may very well ghess to be the reason why you would not scan the Popes words. Nor need I make

other answer to *Cherubinus*, he (as your self say) agreeing with the Pope. This is the main prop of your whole cause; and yet how weak it proves when seriously and indifferently examin'd! though I freely confess it might easily be mistaken by an unwary Reader fully possess't of the contrary perswasion.

You see, now, Sir, the way a Scholar that understands Logick would have taken here, is, since every Question is of whether something *be* or *be not* (that is, of some Proposition, that is, whether some Predicate be identify'd to the Subject) to show that the Predicate of the proposition you would evince is the Predicate here; your Subject, the Subject. By this method you might have hop't to arrive to some *strength of sence*. But instead of doing this you onely cry aloud the words are *most plain and express for you, that they most clearly and evidently condemn us*; and then to prove it, you are very high against your Adversary's *over sight*, his *prepossession*, his *boldness*, his *confidence*. Sometimes he is blam'd for an absurdity almost *impossible* in *overlooking* it; Anon, you say, *to do him right* (as if you would confess you did him *wrong* before) he did *see it and cite it*. Strange

challenge

challenge of over-sight which consists with a grant of both *seeing and citing*! So that all you bring in your own behalf, and this in the main support of your cause, is contradiction to your self, calumny of your Adversary, many bold sayings, and not one Schollar-like attempt of proof. Sweet Sir, will this serve think you to prove your Adversary a Puny, and your self a great Clerk? or rather will not the Reader judge that the differences of your performance will transpose those appellations?

In your thirteenth Section you reprehend your Adversary that he pretends there was but *one Question onely disputed and defin'd at that time*, and affirm stoutly that *it is not possible for him to perswade an Intelligent Reader thereof*; though both the Pope and *Cherubinus* by your confession call it *a Question*, and not *Questions*. 'Tis an hard case that the Pope's own word cannot protect him, but we must be put to prove the Pope spake what he thought. But, let us see your Arguments. You say the Pope makes *two Questions*, and that *Cherubinus does the same* (their words being equivalent, I see not why I should make two disputings of the same case) *the first of Souls in which nothing remain'd to be*

*purg'd; the other of Souls in which something is to be purg'd.* But since by your own confession, and by the words cited by your self they say these two made but one *Question*, a man would have expected you should bring somewhat to prove what you say, and not upon your bare word force us to beleeve they contradict themselves in the same period. But, to speak sence as well as words, who knows not that the word *Question* may have two meanings; one, to signify what may be *ask't*; another what is or may be *doubted*. An *asking* may be fram'd of any proposition we are ignorant of; a *doubting* onely of those against which we have some kind of apparent reason. Now, you are pleas'd to look no farther than for what may be *ask't*; but your Adversary goes on to what may be *doubted* of; and, therefore, finding no speciall doubt of one part of the persons you divide which was not in the other, he was so *clear-sighted* as to find that the Pope and *Cherubinns* expresst themselves properly and dogmatically; whereas you make them break the common Laws both of Sence and Grammar; and, when they would speak of many *Questions*, to use the singular number. You add a confirmation

out

out of the Title of the Bull, in which in the plurall number *Articles* are ſayd to be *defin'd*; not diſtinguiſhing betwixt *Articles* and *Queſtions*, whereas an *Article* muſt be fore-debated to be call'd a *Queſtion*. So that, if there had been but one Article doubted of and debated, there was but *one Queſtion* decided, though *many Articles* defin'd.

Nor do you well appeal to the 2d. Scholion of *Cherubinus*, where you onely find that *ten Hereſies are condemned by this Bull*, for it is a far different thing to condemn a known falſity, and to determin a doubted queſtion. So that your *clear-ſight* fail'd you alſo in this point. As for *Eymericus* I eaſily confeſs of his worth, all that *Pegna* writes: But, as all that doth not except him from being a man, ſo neither from having had his imperfections; and this in particular that he was too cenſorious; which is pardonable in him, few Saints arriving to a perfect exinanition of proper intereſt, till towards the End of their dayes. Wherefore, as all Judges for the moſt part are ſubject to draw cauſes to their own Courts, ſo this Inquiſitour was willing to make many heads, upon which Delinquents might fall within the compaſs of the Inquiſition, by

which means he set great quarrels betwixt his own Order and that of Saint *Francis*, condemning *Raymundus Lullus*, whom the *Franciscans* maintain to be a Saint, of *Heresy*, for attempting *to demonstrate the Trinity*. In which controversy our modern Divines side much with the *Franciscans*. Hence I infer you can ground little upon this Author as to increasing Articles of Faith. Your citation out of *Spondanus* is less to the purpose, for his relation reports nothing more to your intent then what is formally in the Bull it self, and, so, already discuss'd: onely I may note that this worthy Author, in that he sayes *the opinion of the Saints not seeing God was not altogether reprov'd or condemn'd in John the two and twentieths dayes*, is mistaken with diyers others of your *eminent Scholars*, as may appear by the Universal out-cry of the Church against him, and the Arts and violences he was fain to use to get Doctours to side with him, as the History of those times doth manifest. I may conclude that notwithstanding your strong confidence that your Adversary never dreamt of these subtill Mysteries you think you have discovered, he saw the truth more cleerly then you with all your great intelligence; and

so

ſo may return your exhortation upon your ſelf, to *beware of heat of youth*, to beware of the ſecret ſnare of *Intereſt*, which many times lurk undiſcovered in the hearts of men of greater age.

In the fourteenth Section you come to the other queſtion of what is the *Subject* of this Bull, which your Adverſary ſayes to conſiſt in this, whether *perfect Charity brings immediatly to Heaven.* And you very complementally beſeech him to tell you how his *cleer-ſighted friends could perſwade him to impoſe ſo groſly upon you, as to ſettle the ſtate of the queſtion in that* whoſe name is not recorded in the whole decree. I confeſs I hold him bound to yeild you ſatiſfaction. And becauſe you have impoſed by your firſt Section the burthen upon me to anſwer for him, in return of your civility my requeſt is, to know how a man of your worth and parts could perſwade your ſelf to deſcend ſo low as to ask a queſtion grounded on ſo triviall an errour, that every School-boy muſt ſee it. I imagin if two words have in a Dictionary the ſame ſignification, and a School boy ſhould deny that his Latin had the ſence in Engliſh which his Maſter aſſerted, becauſe one of the two words was not in it. I fear his Maſter would

would think him negligent enough to deserve the rod. So if the word *Justus* signify one that is in charity, and you, who take upon you so high an Authority of censuring, will flatly and challengingly deny the *thing* to be there because the *very word* is not there, you seem to me most extremely unreasonable: What if instead of an Angel of gold, I give you half a Piece, is it not all one? or, which perhaps you will think more like our case, instead of the term defin'd suppose the definition? You object therefore more strongly, that he requires *the Popes positive is or is not*; And if you do not shew that, and yet will obstinately persist to draw from this Definition that Souls are delivered before the day of Judgment *you hazard to contradict both Bull and Council.* The rest of the Argument though plainly and strongly urg'd you omit at the present, what you will do hereafter we shall see. This last point that *you hazard to contradict the Council and Pope* you stumble at. But why (I pray) if you know not their minds about that point do you not hazard to choose the wrong for the right. I understand no otherwise. But you insist upon his admission that the Pope was of that mind. First

that

that admiſſion comes after this ſpeech of his. Secondly it is but a permiſſion, not a certification, for out of it, you are never the ſecurer that indeed it was ſo, and ſo ſtill remain in *hazard*. As for his requiring an *is or is not*, I wonder you ſhould except againſt it; this being the very ſubſtance of the queſtion in hand. I pray, reflect (as any ingenious Reader I ſuppoſe will) that the Pope may either *think* that ſome Souls are purg'd before the day of Judgment, and yet neither *intend to ſay* it, nor *in fact ſay* it: He may again both *think* ſo and *intend to ſay* it, and yet *not ſay* it; laſtly, he may do all three: Let us then for Argument ſake ſuppoſe, that, he did all three, and that this would make an Article of Faith of what was not ſo before, for ſome of *your eminent Schollars* hold that. Doth any of them ſay his pure *thought* has that power, or his *Will* if it budds not into *words*? None that ever I heard of. The moſt demand publication and affixion *ad Valvas Sanctæ Petri*, and *in acie Campi Floræ*, and ſuch like formalities, far more viſible than an ambiguous elocution or ſuppoſition; which you, without being able to ſhew any expreſs word, will needs fix upon us for a yoak to ſubmit all underſtandings unto.

unto. Do not reprove ſo fiercely unleſs you can give a better account of your Doctrin and actions. It becomes you not.

---

## THIRD DIVISION.

## Containing an Anſwer to his fifteenth and ſixteenth Sections.

*The true Queſtion eſtabliſht, and the ſence of the Bull and Canon defended againſt the miſtakes of his learned Divine. Some Notes evidencing that nothing about the Duration of Purgatory was defin'd in the Council of Florence.*

SO much concerning your reply *ad hominem*. Now, let us ſay a word to your queſtion it ſelf. By the precedent diſcourſe 'tis apparent there was but *one* formall queſtion diſputed in theſe times, though the *predicate* belong'd to diverſe *ſubjects* as all univerſall Predicates do. Of which kind

(*viz.*

(*viz.* universall Predicates) 'tis impossible to see *one* if the Questions must be counted as many as the subjects to which they are applyable. Now then in our present case I averr the Question to be *Utrum justus nihil habens purgandum immediate potiatur visione Dei.* Nor do I see how possibly you can deny either the Question to be *One*, or to be *this*; Since the Pope himself both expresly calls it *one* and puts it to be *this*. Which being agreed on, let us see what signifies the Subject, [*Justus nihil habens purgandum*] *Just men or Souls in which there remaines nothing to be purg'd.* To Divines a *Just man* or Soul signifies one that is indu'd with charity; and *to have nothing to be purg'd*, signifies to have not so much as a veniall Sin left to be purg'd in them, that is, according to *S. Thomas* his Doctrin, to have his Charity totally fervent & perfect. Now *John* the 22th. deny'd that such Souls went to heaven before the day of Judgment: His opposits, the main Body of the Church, affirm'd it. If then this explication be on all parts evident, what can be answerd why this, according to your Adversary's tenet, was not the onely handled and debated Question? unles you will return to that triviall excuse, as to cry, the *word* is not

there

there but onely the ſence and meaning. And, where I pray, does your Adverſary pretend that his *very words are in the Bull*, that you challenge him ſo vaporingly to ſhew you the Queſtion in termes? I find him indeed ſay that 'twas the *Deſigne, aym, driſt, intention* of the Definers, but I do not ſee him undertake that *perfect Charity brings an immediate Heaven* were preciſely the *terms* of the definition. Your ſelf cannot but obſerve he ſeverally phraſes the Queſtion, as ſometimes *whether Souls perfect in charity ſee God immediatly*, ſometimes in other words; attending to the ſence as ſober and intelligent Writers ſhould do, not ſtanding upon *terms* as dodging Sophiſters do. Look but into the Teſtimonies which your ſelf cite, and indeed what all Hiſtorians and Divines report, and ſee whether they do not unanimouſly agree that this was the Queſtion. I think I may after ſo much evidence excuſe the anſwering of your Adverſary's Argument drawn from the Pope's ſo pious recommends of *Holy deſires*; for, ſince the Queſtion is not chang'd, but by you miſtaken and pitifully not underſtood, and that your whole ſolution relies upon that defect, His Argument remaines in its full ſtrength. Onely, I will

ask

aſk your pardon if I preſume to direct you in the example of the *Eutychians* and *Monothelites*. You argue thus: *when the Church combated the Eutychians, it did not onely define the plurality of Wils againſt the Monothelites, &c.* what you would ſay I cannot tell; If, that the Church defin'd both the plurality of Natures and Wills, you diſcover too much Ignorance, for it defin'd onely the plurality of Natures: If, that it defin'd onely the plurality of natures not of wills, you ſay right, but it comes quite croſe to your intention, which ſtrives to prove that ſomething is defin'd by connexion, not formally ſet down in the Definition. Wherefore your Diſcourſe ſeems to me imperfect and perplext.

Now then I may fairly proceed to your fifteenth Section where again I meet with *Eymericus*; but, becauſe he either ſayes no more than the Bull or obliges not ſo much, I ſhall agree with you that he is a grave and learned Authour, without contending any farther about what conduces ſo little to our main Concluſion. Onely, give me leave to note this defect in him where he ſayes theſe points were *made of Faith by this Bull*, If that be his meaning, twas a great weaknes in a writer ſo neer

thoſe

those times and living when the noyse was not yet ceas'd. For, if the truth of these Articles were not known before this Bull, what reverence was it in the whole Christian world publikly to term the Pope an *Heretick*, and preach against him, even in the Court of *Avignon*; as an Englishman of *Eymericus* his order, by name *Thomas Wallis* did, and was imprison'd for it. No; these points were the constant Tradition of the Church, and this Bull serv'd not to bring in a *new Faith*, but to quiet the world, and by Authority to quell the spirits mov'd by *John the* 22th.

In your sixteenth Section you pass on to the Council of *Florence*; but it's definition being exactly according to the Bull, there is no hope of any new advantage to your cause from thence. Yet you will try again, though with the same Argument, and we beg your Readers patience if we repeat the same Answer. First you cite the Council that some *Souls are purg'd by the punishments of Purgatory after their body's death*. Which would have seemd very little to the purpose, your Adversary professing the same, had not you long before laid a snake in the grass to use his sting when occasion should serve; which here

you

you begin, presently adding that *this can find no admittance in your new model. For all the suffering of Soules which you fancy by their irregular and now unchangeable affections avail nothing as to the purging and cleansing of Soules, &c.* Now I see why you neglected my book of the *middle state*, and what I write of it in my *Sacred Institutions*, that you might freely slander the Catholick truth I teach about Purgatory, to those who know no more, then what you cited out of a treatise of philosophy, where there was no intention to speak either of purgatory or in deed Christianity. But because you will dilate your self as I suppose more largly herafter, I will deferr the question till then.

You will have your Adversary observe that when the Council in the fourth Article declares that *Soules which are purg'd being uncloth'd of their bodies are immediately received into heaven*, this doctrine by the Parenthesis of (*as is aboves ayd*) is wholly built upon the former Doctrin of *the Purging it self*. And I, Sir, would desire you to note, that because neither in the third nor in the fourth Article any time of *compleating* the Purgation is express'd or insinuated, that your note is nothing to your Purpose, nor

doth any way conduce to shew a *complete Purgation* of them *while unclothed*. And this, though it were true that a Purgation by punishment in Purgatory were against your adversary; which is a pure conceit of your own brain.

You proceed to an Antiparallel of the Councels Doctrin to ours, and to manage it the better you most freely assume what you finde not in the Councell. I mean these words *being purged unclothed of their bodies*, which signify in plain English that the purgation is perfected while they remain yet unclothed. The equivalent of which sence, if it bee not in the Council as all my endevours cannot find it, I must perforce protest that as I should be content you wrong'd me to do the Council right, so to slander the Council that you may wrong me is a thing unsufferable in any, much more in a religious Person. In the parallel you give for my side, you put *a vast grief by reason those pleasures are now impossible to be enjoy'd*. Shew this in all my books ever apply'd to the Soules in Purgatory and carry the question: if you cannot, consider what you make me suffer among them who believe you. You desire your adversary farther to note that *some purgate* is the

preter

preter perfect tense, and shew that the purgation is past'd. And are you so anadvis'd as not to know the Council speaks as well of the Souls to go out of their bodies the following ages, as in those before? so that this *being past'd* must stay in some even to the day of Judgment by your own explication?

After this you seek farther into the roots of the Council even from its beginning at *Ferrara*. But as far as I see you are not very expert in the story. For at *Ferrara* was deliver'd to the Fathers of the Council a long oration by *Marcus Ephesius* who would never consent to the Councils resolutions about Purgatory. But his action concerns not us much, so we understand the meaning of the main body of the Greeks, whose propositions when you have recited, you infer 'twere absurd to deny that *the question of Purgatory was here disputed and defined*, by which you discover a great mind to play foul, but your fingers are not nimble enough to carry it handsomly; you craftily would perswade the incautious Reader that we deny'd Purgatory, but then you spoil all by putting a wrong term, for truly the question of Purgatory was not *disputed*, but from the beginning

agreed on by both sides; but a question concerning Purgatory, that is, whether there were true fire in it was debated, and so, for any thing the Council says, or I know it may be debated still. Of the other points expreſt in the decree of the Council there was an agreement without debate betwixt the generality of the Greeks and the Latins.

You go on pronouncing that *in these professions both sides agreed against us directly, and home to our point in question*; without expreſſing in what, or bringing any proof of it. For your ſelf have before confeſt we hold both *expiation* and *delivery*, and the onely question betwixt us is whether before the day of Judgment this expiation end: of which (though the very preciſe point we contend about) you ſtill have the ill luck to fall ſhort; you offer ſometimes indeed to rack your Teſtimonies to confeſs what you deſire, were not the words too faithfull to their Speakers ſence, to be corrupted by you: but if they will not do in Latin, you have a trick to turn them into Engliſh, and piece them out with ſtuff of your own, making their ſence to be this, *their preſent delivery whilſt uncloth'd?* this you ſay the Council intended

to

to deliver as the Faith of the Church, in this both the Greek and Latin Fathers clearly agreed, and yet plainly the conclusion I sustain was neither agreed to, nor debated, nor question'd, if I be truly accus'd as the first Inventer of it, nor so much as mention'd. You conclude, it must be an act not of understanding, but of will to say *presently* signifies, *at the day of Judgment.* Truly it would be so, and in the mean while 'tis an act of ill will, to impose on your Adversary that he sayes it.

Now a word to the discourse of an *eminently learned Divine* which you mark with the letter C. And for his learning I have nothing to say, why it should not be *eminently* above yours, but for his wylines he is far short of you, and if any thing corrupt his Judgment, it is self-conceit and down-right passion, his unhappy humors, that strangely abound in him. But I cannot omit to note in you, that you had not the luck to give his Paper a convenient title, but printed it just as he had written it for his own memory. The entrance of his discourse is very good; But his first proposition concerning the matter, plainly and unexcusably mistaken; for he sayth, *the matter in dispute betwixt the Latins*

*and the Greeks was what Souls were admitted or to be admitted to eternal Beatitude before the day of Judgment.* A question that neither you as far as I can guess, nor we ever found in this Council. Neither do I remember to have met with such a gradation of Saints in any Author: Therefore, I leave this great Doctor to prove that there ever was such a question mov'd. His next leap though he calleth *it this question*, yet is quite from the question in hand; being whether there be *fire in Purgatory* or no. Which how it appertains to his mainly proposed question I leave to better wits to consider. But I gather, that this Paper was onely private notes, not written in a form to be printed, and that you have done very indiscreetly and to his dishonour, to expose them to the publick. He puts next the Latins position, in which you who *cannot pardon your Adversaries sloath* in perusing of the Council, omit a sentence most pertinent of any thing to the cause, to wit; that *he who hath committed many offences is freed after a longer time of purgation, but he who hath committed a few is sooner delivered*, which particularity had it been in the *decision* of the Council, would have been something to the purpose, and

saved

saved you the labour of corrupting the Council by your additions. But I must note that this *eminent* man useth this phrase *in this world*, and *in the next* for before the day of Judgment and after, not (as I think) by affectation, but by negligence, which still more confirms me, that the whole draught were but private notes, and not fram'd for the print.

He goes on to give the variety of opinions concerning their going to Heaven, in which he says: *the Greeks imagin that the Souls of just men have indeed obtained Beatitude, but not perfectly, and that they shall perfectly enjoy it when they shall be reunited to their bodies*: which position, so far (by his leave) is common also to some principal Latin Fathers. He adds that the Greeks say that *in the mean while they remain in a separated place, where they interiourly rejoice, entertaining their thoughts with the fore-seen and fore-known perfect Beatitude and adoption which is prepared for them.* But in the conclusion he seems to say that *after many disputations* the Greeks came to the ensuing resolutions which are well known. In which he slaunders the Greek Church, for it was but a part of them that maintained this last mention'd position, upon

the like Testimonies as *John* the two and twentieth did amongst the Latins, so you see that his master piece for which he esteems himself so highly, to wit, to understand what the opinion of the Eastern Church was, is a meer illusion bred out of the reading some Schismaticks works, whom he took to be the mouth of the Greek Church. For the Greeks themselves who at *Rome* write against Hereticks Profess that the Faith of the Greeks concerning Purgatory is contain'd in their *Euchologies* & *Rituals* which are ancient and used both by Catholicks and Schismaticks. For as to their writers, if you read one, you know not who else will agree with him. So various and irregular are their explications. Now if their *Rituals* and *Euchologies* be not more express then the Latins for your opinion, you will easily see what will become of you, there being not one word of delivery before the day of Judgment, but all that is any way express referr'd thither: which you are pleased to neglect though it be the publick profession of the Church, and to seek birds-nests in the bushes of probable Authours.

Next then, your *eminently learned man* makes his reflexions upon the word *presently*,

*ſently*, juſt as wiſely as you, perſwading himſelf that we think the natural and formal ſignification of it is *at the day of Judgment*, and inſiſting upon it, becauſe it is added onely to this member. As if the reaſon were not evident, to wit, becauſe the time was to be ſet down uncertainly onely in this member; *Preſently* therefore ſignifieth *as ſoon as purg'd*, whenſoever that be, according to the variety of opinions. He goes on to tell us that *neither Greeks nor Latins doubted of the delivery of Souls at the day of Judgment*, which is very true, and therefore alſo they put no more down. He adds that the *ſole difficulty was of the precedent time, as both their declarations do manifeſt.* But this *manifeſtation* was made in his learned brain, for in the text there is no ſight of any ſuch conteſt betwixt them. But it appears that the Greeks held their tongues about it, and the Latins were content they ſhould do ſo. At laſt your *learned man* would perſwade us that it is moſt plain in *Benedictus* his Bull, and that there the word [*Preſently*] *moſt manifeſtly ſignifies before the day of Judgment*. But becauſe he ſent me not the magnifying ſpectacles of Paſſion which he uſed, I could not perceive ſuch *evidence*. He concludes with, *what may*

*be*

*he judge of me, who call this Definition of a holy Pope and Council, a new Doctrin.* I pray certify him that I neither believe him nor you, that the Doctrin I call *new* is either the Popes or the Councils.

Which that it may appear better, I give you a few notes for our side, upon the Council. The first was that there was no debate betwixt the Greeks and Latins concerning Purgatory but onely about *fire*, and with some Greeks about *the Vision of God* by confessedly *just men*, so that your learned mans wilfull supposition of a strife concerning the gradation of Saints coming to Beatitude is a pure fiction, without any ground of History, and his whole discourse built upon it, nothing but the humming of a *Chimara* feeding upon *entia rationis*. My second note is that whereas the Latins put in their confession that some of those who requir'd purgation came *sooner* to Beatitude, others *later*; The Greeks after they had seen the Latins confession, quite left out that point, and this upon the fourteenth day of *June*, whereas the Latins put in their propositions the fourth, so that you see it was not for haste or over-sight, but because it was not settled amongst them, as it seem'd to be amongst the Latins. My third

note

note is, that the Greeks expreſs the puniſhments of Purgatory to conſiſt in *griefe*, to wit, for their ſins and for the *want of Beatitude* which are the ſame in which I alſo think the pains of Purgatory conſiſt, howſoever you pleaſe not to take notice of it. My fourth note is that the Latins never took notice of the Greeks diſagreement in point of coming to bliſs, *ſome ſooner, ſome later*, but proceeded joyntly to the Definition with words abſtracting from both ſides of this controverſy. All this is ſo manifeſt in the letter of the Council, that there can be no diſpute, in truth, of any part, though of this later, you and your learned aſſiſtant will force a diſputation thruſting in a ſence which the words bear not, without ſhame or care of your conſcience in ſo wicked an attempt as to corrupt a Council.

Now out of theſe Notes I frame a demonſtration, as ſtrong as the nature of ſuch a caſe can bear.

*Where a difference is ſo plain betwixt 2 parties that it is not poſſible to be hidden from either, and yet neither part takes notice of it, it is plain, they do not hold that difference to be materiall.*

*But there was a known and plain and inconteſtable difference betwixt the Greeks and*

*Latins*

*Latines concerning this tenet whether some Soules were purged sooner then others, the Latines putting it down expressly, and the Greeks after having seen the Latins confession, leaving it quite out, and yet no quarrel or disputation arose betwixt them about this point.*

*Therefore neither part took it for a materiall point of Religion and Controversie.*

Now then you see wherin consisted the agreement of the two Churches concerning this point, to wit, in this that neither of them thought it a matter to contend about. I pray express your opinion in this point whether if the Latins had believ'd it an *Heresy* to say one Soul was not deliver'd before another, could they in conscience have admitted the Greek Church to communion without declaring their mind in this point, and this after so open an opposition, as to leave out all mention of it when the Latins had so positively express'd it? If you think Councils can dissemble in points of this quality, I believe the world wil soon confess that I, as stubborn as you reckon me, give far more reverence to Councells then you do. Wherefore I press you farther out of the Council. If any man should say it was an Heresy to hold there were no materiall fire

in

in Purgatory, or that it was not lawfull to consecrate in leaven'd Bread, you would not spare to tell him that since the Council had declared it indifferent, he stood not with the Council, but seem'd at least to contradict it if he held it were a matter of Faith. So do I press you, since the Council hath pass'd this point for an *indifferent* one, He that will say the opposite is an *Heresy* is malapert beyond *his* strength. *Arrogantia ejus plus quam fortitudo ejus.*

You give us another paper, which you say was written by a nameless Schollar of mine. I could reply I have none. For who converse with me, I tell them they must *see* themselves, not *trust* me; which if they do, they are Scholars to truth, not to me; If they trust me they follow me not, and so are not my Scholars. But I have too much ground to suspect you aym at some advantage against me by characterring him a *very able proficient in my School*, and repeating it so often; as if you would have men think that both Friends and Foes were all against me. I must then once more tell you that the Authour of that Letter never was addicted to my Doctrin, nor pretended to be my follower (however you have got a trick to call all my *Followers* that will not censure

me

me as loud as you, nor willingly assent to your uncharitable carriage) nor was he ever given to be curious in such kind of dissertations, no not even to that degree as to have read my *middle State*, which made him more easily liable to surprise in mistaking the Council at the first sight, taking all for right which your *learned Dsvine* writ concerning it; so that it was candid credulity of your Friends wrong relation of it, not want of Judgment which betray'd him into the errour of imagining the Bull and Council on your side, not did he dream his Letter should ever come into print, it being writ privately to the other as a Friend, otherwise in likelihood he would have sifted the Testimonies himself, and not have taken them on others account. So that you first uncivilly print a private Letter of his, surreptitiously procur'd, without his knowledge; then mischaracter him *an able proficient in my School*, my *Follower*, *&c.* whereas what he writes is onely like a moderate and grave Christian, who knows he is not even by Principles of Charity to interpret as disobedient one who publickly submits to the Church; and so I look upon it as an act of charity, not of particular Friendship to me. But since you

love

love to have it thought your party can gain some advantage against those who are *proficients* by my Books, I will shew you one, your present Adversary, whom your self character to be but a *puny in my School*, and as I hear never appear'd in print, nor set himself to write before, yet has so prudently foyl'd you in every encounter in this Question, that he hath left nothing for me but to discover your falshood in such by-questions as you thrust in to stuff out your Volume.

## FOURTH DIVISION.
## Containing an Answer to his seventeenth Section.

*The Authours Doctrin of Councils explicated: This new opinion of Purgatory in likelihood later than Saint* Gregory.

IN your seventeenth Section you first put upon me that I *am arm'd against the Authority of Popes and Councils*, and then you run headlong on with declamatory invectives

vectives upon that ſuppoſition. But, as the world is curious, I conceive ſome will light on my defence as well as on your calumny, to whom I thus explicate the true ſtate of the queſtion. It is known to all Chriſtians that Chriſt and his Apoſtles taught the world the Chriſtian faith. It is known to all Catholicks, that this ſame faith has continued in the Catholick Church now fifteen ages. It is known to the ſame that the means of continuing this faith hath been by Paſtours, and Fathers teaching their Children what themſelves had learn'd by the ſame way. It is likewiſe known that in divers ages there aroſe up divers Hereticks, who endeavour'd to bring in Doctrins contrary to the received Faith: and that Biſhops, ſometimes in particular (eſpecially the Biſhop of *Rome*) ſometimes in Collections or Councils with-ſtood and confounded ſuch Hereticks confirming the old belief, and rejecting all new inventions. It is evident that to do this it ſuffices to have veracity enough to atteſt what the old Doctrin was, and power enough to ſuppreſs all ſuch as ſtir againſt it. Thus far all goes well. Of late Ages among our curious School-men ſome have been ſo ſubtle that the *Old* faith would not ſerve them,

but

but they thought it necessary to bring in *new* points of Faith, and because what was not *of Faith* could not *become of Faith* without a new revelation, they look't about for a new revelation; and, finding the two supreme Courts of Christian discipline, seated in General Councils and the Pope, they quickly resolv'd to attribute the power of encreasing Christian Faith to these two Springs of Christianity. Now, the first difference betwixt the two parties engag'd in the present controversy is, whether the Faith deliver'd by the Apostles be sufficient to govern the Church by, or there be necessary fresh Additions of such points as cannot be known without a new revelation. In which they whom I follow hold the negative, they whom I suppose you follow, the affirmative. Out of this question springs a second, whether in the Councils and in the Pope is to be acknowledg'd a Prophetical kind of Spirit, by which towards the ordinary government of the Church, they have a gift to reveal some things not before revealed, nor deducible out of things already revealed by the natural power of discourse which God has left to mankind to govern it self by. In which point also I follow them

that deny, you and your *eminent learned men* ſtand up for the Affirmative.

I hope by this any ingenious Reader will perceive that, if the Faith deliver'd by Jeſus Chriſt joyn'd with the natural power of diſcourſing be ſufficient to govern the Church of God, then thoſe who give power to Councils and Popes ſufficient to govern by this way, give them as much as is neceſſary for the Church. But if *new* Articles be neceſſary to the government of the Church then, and only then, they fall ſhort. So that no underſtanding perſon reading theſe lines can doubt but the true queſtion is this, whether the Faith deliver'd by Chriſt be *ſufficient for the government of the Church*; or, that we muſt expect new additions to our Faith every age, or when occaſion preſents it ſelf. Whence it will eaſily appear that all the great noyſe you make, and furious Rhetorick you uſe, of, *my denying the Authority of Councils*; *my being arm'd againſt them*; and ſuch like angry ſtuff, are but uncharitable, uncivil, and highly injurious clamours without any true cauſe or ground at all. But we ſhall hear more of theſe hereafter.

Now, any prudent Chriſtian that ſhall, with moderate attention, have read but ſo far,

sar, will judge the question already decided: For who dare maintain Christ's Doctrin was *imperfect*? And indeed all that have any little modesty on your side, will not say *new Articles* of Faith are necessary, but that whatsoever the Church defines was before revealed; though when they come to declare themselves they demand really *new Articles*, onely calling them Explications of the former, or Deductions from them: And if they would justify that they were but such Deductions as natural reason can deduce, there would remain no controversy, which in very deed the Churches practise shews to be the truth. In the first Council it being recorded, that there was *Congaudium magnum*, and all Councils, and Popes ever since proceeding in the same style.

But here I must remember you what you said in the beginning concerning Purgatory, that the reason why you write against my opinion was because it was *translated into English*. And so I now protest, that you are the cause why I write of this subject in English. My books generally are to debate what I think in the points I write of with learned men, whose care it is to divulge truths to the people, dispensing to

every one the quantity he is capable of, not to raise any new thoughts in ignorant heads. Your crying out against me forces me to a necessary defence before the people; wherefore if any disputings concerning this matter displease any person of Judgment, let it light upon your head who are the provoker, and compeller of me into this new task, which both age and other thoughts make me slowly and unwillingly undertake. But I must not be mine own chuser, but follow God.

As to what you say against this Doctrin: first you desire your Reader to consider that if these grounds, to wit, that *the Pope and the Council can err*, (without distinguishing in what either matter or manner of proceeding) *Christian Faith is a meer mockery*. I confess the proposition grave in words, but in sence not worthy a Schoolboy. For, first, I ask you, whether you mean in *necessary* points or *unnecessary* ones? If you say, in both, I doubt your whole School will desert you. For who is there that hath an ounce of brains who will give authority to the Church to determin all the subtle quirks of the School? But if you say onely *necessary* ones, then before you went farther against me you should have prov'd

that

that the verities come by inheritance from *Jesus Christ* are not all that are *necessary*, which question you never think on, and so brandish your Logick against the apparitions in the clouds. Secondly, I ask you whether without counsel or with it? If you say without it, again your School will desert you. If you say with it, I ask you how much counsell, and to what period? In all which you will be at a loss. Must it hold till by reason they see a necessary connexion with the deliver'd Faith? if you say so you desert your vertue of prophesying, and come over to our School, which you so abominate as *rational* and *faithless*: yet this, experience teaches us, is the way that Popes and Councils use to take. If you say their consulting must not hold till they see it by reason, then tell me, what *Oedipus* or Geometrician can guess or fix the terminating line of counsell prerequisite? These points a Scholar would have settled. You distinguish nothing but jumble all your Bells together into a confused noise, and deafen more then instruct your Hearers. Now 'tis to much purpose to talk of the force of the word *Anathema*, whilest you have not settled a *matter* in which the Church hath a *power* to impose it. What

an inconsiderate manner of arguing is this?

You say *Catholiks require no other assurance of their Faith, then upon this firm foundation that our holy Mother the Church is their infallible directress.* The proposition is the very Tenet we mainly advance and stick to. Go but consequently to this, and we shall have no quarrell. You add another ground, *that the Councils (her mouth) are the unerring deliverers of truth.* This also is very true and never deny'd by us. But there rises a great question whether Councils be perpetually and in all cases the mouth of the Church: look upon *Curiolanus* his abridgment of the Councils, and read his division of General Councils into *approbata* and *reprobata*, and *ex parte approbata*, and *ex parte improbata*: and see how ignorantly you go to work even in the grounds of your own *eminent learned men*, who will oppose you peradventure more then I, and yet you preach *Christian Religion is a mockery* if this be taken away. I desire not to look into particulars, unless you force me to it. For I cannot discover even your Errours, without discovering too the vanity of that School which you nickname the Church, and confidently

fidently take upon you to be one of her Masters. I doubt not if you attentively consider your *eminent Scholars* you will find many of them speak indeed gloriously of Councils; but, unless I be strangely deceiv'd, they give them less of inward and real Authority then I; while they make them, in effect, but *Cyphers* to the Pope, without whom they signify nothing, though added perhaps to him they increase his signification, yet surely not very much; since, in many of those Masters opinion, he *alone* is infallible, and I think in every ones opinion, *all together* are not much more. Whereas the Doctrin I follow gives them an absolute Inerrancy in testifying receiv'd truths; which is clearly sufficient to conserve and propagate the Faith of the Church.

I believe you mistake the meaning of that grave and worthy Person, whom, without any ground at all for your conceit, you call my Scholar, since he seriously protests, he never gave his mind that way, nor ever read over any considerable part of my Books, not particularly, this of the *Middle State*: his true meaning I conceive is, we may know when Councils and Consistory's apply themselves right, by

examining (not Tradition it self for that's evident in the sence of the Faithfull, but) their proceedings by Tradition, whether they be conformable to it. Which is not onely a maintainable but excellent truth. And by this method the Divines of those dayes examin'd the Doctrin of *John* 22. For, Tradition is the Law of Christ planted in the hearts of all Christians, not to be examin'd; it being to be read, fair written there by their externall words and conversations. Now if a Pope or Council be supposed to deliver Doctrin against this, 'tis past darkness and examining, since all the Christian world cannot choose but resent it, and know it to be against their Faith and Judgment. So that you plainly misunderstand the meaning of *Tradition*, which is no hidden thing, but the publick and settled *belief* of the Christian world.

You will say, 'tis impossible a Pope or Council should proceed so grosly. I wish there were no examples of it. But the truth is, if instead of a Pope, consider'd onely *personally*, you take him as presiding in his Church and Seat, and joyn'd with it, which is a kind of more then a Provinciall Council; but much more if you take a

*General*

*General Council*, without extraordinary violence without or within, both *mainly visible*, this cannot happen, and so they have infallibility in enacting the received Doctrine, most absolutely sufficient to secure the Church against being mis-led by them.

By the same Errour you look to determin Faith by *Inquest*, not knowing it cannot be unknown in a Catholick Country to them that live there. See the story of *Luther*. Were men doubtfull of their Faith, before he and his fellows in iniquity set themselves to snarl at it? Therefore *Inquest* may be made how to answer their Argumments, but not to understand what the Church held before opposition rose. How much mistaken is all your discourse about the proceeding to higher Tribunals after so great diligence of scrutiny? There is no such thing as *scrutiny* necessary to find out Faith, nor ever was the Church to seek her Faith. Since she once receiv'd it from *Jesus Christ* she never lost it, and so is to look into it, not for it. If any thing be to be lookt for, it is not faith, it may be some Theologicall Verity, not *faith*. Your discourse therefore is wholly out of the way. No wonder then you find your self

at

at a loss, and cry out like a blind man for a hand to guide you, since instead of *Christs* faith, you look for a *new* faith. One would have it an Article of our *Christian* faith, that his Order is a true Religious Order. Another, that one hang'd for treason is a true Martyr: others seek some private revelation that brings in profit, to be canonized for faith, and other such fine questions to be put in the Creeds of the Church, and if it be not yeelded there's a power in the Church to impose such beliefs upon them, presently the denying Doctrin is an *Exterminating Schism, and puts up by the roots all the foundations of Christian Religion.*

Not will there want some to say, that though these things be true, they are not to be published, but Catholicks are to be left in ignorance of such tender points: But will not the mischief by degrees grow intolerable, if once it should come to that height that the People by a preoccupated credence, be apt to be fir'd seditiously against their naturall and lawfull Governour, by any surreptitious Rescript fetch't from beyond Sea, fruitfully seal'd with the new stamp of faith: and to believe all *Christianity is ruin'd* if such a Rescript,

nay

nay the Interpretation of the procurers be any way doubted of. O strange unhappy times!

You press farther that according to me *the Church hath de facto erred in the Bull and Council* so long treated of. What a strange boldness is this? you bring an Interpretation against Grammar, against Logick, and against Divinity, and if this be not accepted of, you cry *the Church has err'd.* Your Interpretation is against *Grammar* by your own confession, complaining of your Adversary for demanding an *Is* or *Is not*, which is a plain acknowledgment that your sence is not formally in the words. It is against Logick, because you put the *subject* to be part of the *predicate*; Against Divinity because you would make the grace of God and heavenly benefits be bought like Salads in the market, by him that has most mony. Besides other inconveniences whereof I have explicated some in my Book of the *Middle State*, and may have occasion to say more hereafter; And yet, forsooth, if this sweet Interpretation be not *gratis* admitted of, *the Church has err'd, the Church has err'd*, and all's undone, well a day, well a day.

You go farther and press that my rule of

of faith failes me in this very point. And first you appeal to *the consciences of all illiterate Persons*, whether this be not their *present faith*. You have found out a Tribunal very fit to gain your cause in. But I wonder you are so little skill'd in spirituall direction, that you do not know, most illiterate men never reflect upon their inward acts, or farther then what belongs to the fancy, not one amongst ten thousand: And you deceive me if you hold faith to be an act of the fancy. Yet I dare not be too bold, for I have heard of one that wore a plush cloak and could neither read nor write. Wherefore it is enough for me to deny it, whether it be your opinion or no.

Besides do you not know that even *literate* Persons, unless Divines, are not to mince the doctrin taught them by their Pastours so far as to distinguish what is deliver'd for *faith* what as necessary to the explication of it, or to the Practise of Christian life: Further you may know that many even of your own *eminent Divines* differ not only in what points *are of faith* what *not*, but in what *makes* them *to be of faith* what *not*. Though I think they all agree that an explication a gainst Grammar and

Logick

Logick does not rayse a position into an Article of faith, though the explication be of a Popes Bull.

Next, you tell your adversary that *Master white him self says* Saint *Gregory* the *great was the first founder of that faith.* I know well you accompt *Master white* a kind of a mad man, that dares advance such propositions as he cannot but foresee what strong opposition they were like to stir up against him. But I did not think he was so mad, as holding no doctrin to belong to faith which began since the Apostles daies, who are the last revealers of publik faith that he knows of, and besides professing this doctrin so far from faith that it is not true, yet should tell you that *Saint Gregory founded this faith.* As far as I remember, what I sayd was, that *Saint Gregory* reported this novelty first broke out in his dayes by the means of certain revelations. And this I sayd upon the authority of *Venerable Bede*, who attributes the book of Dialogues to *Saint Gregory*. But now I must tell you that upon fuller consideration, I rather believe *Venerable Bede's* information was defective, then to attribute so unworthy a book to so grave and learned a Pope; nothing like such winter tales

tales as are told in that book being found in his most worthy and learned works. And I will make your self, whom I know a great admirer of that learned and pious Doctour, Judg of the controversy. Do you think there is in the next world Excommunications and restorings to communion as is expresst in one of those Revelations? Do you think that one who dy'd *obstinate in schisme* was sent to Purgatory because he did many Alms as is reported in another Revelation? do you think it is not the fancy of an Idle brain to imagin Souls are sentenc bathes to scrub and rub men there to be acquitted of their sins? Other things there are in the same book worth the noting, but these are enough to shew it unworthy of *St. Gregory*; as indeed it is for so great a Doctour and Prelate to spend his time in gathering together private stories of obscure and petty Relaters. This will set this Doctrin an hundred years later, and into an age one of the least cultivated since the beginning of the Church of God.

Nor is it true that *this carries after it a practise testified by Foundations, Prayers, Masses, Alms, &c.* For all these were in the Church before this Doctrin, as may appear in Antiquity. The Church of *Afrik* made

made a Canon to force the laity to contribute to Prayers for the dead about Saint *Austins* time, who yet testifies that the question whether Souls were deliver'd out of Purgatory before the day of Judgment had not yet been moved. Now *Foundations* contradict this Doctrin, rather then promote it. For he that makes a *Foundation* intends it without limit of time; and so must imagin the Soul needs the assistance of that charity so long; which would much cool the devotion you pretend, and we see practis'd before our eyes, to get Masses enow in a morning to send a Soul to Heaven to dinner. Shew me but one ancient Instance where two or three thousand Masses have been by Legacy procur'd to be said the very next morning after the Testator's departure, and little or nothing after that morning; and I will ingenuously confess it the best argument you have produc'd in the whole managing of your cause.

After the Author of the *Dialogue* there was no more news of this opinion till *Odilo*, a Monk of *Cluny's*, time: who being a kind of a Generall of many Monasteries, dilated this Doctrin in them, upon a goodly ground to build a matter of Faith on, to wit, the report of a French Pilgrim who

sayd

sayd he had met with an Hermite (I think a French man) who perswaded himself he had Visions of Souls being deliver'd out of Purgatory by the Prayers of the Monks of *Cluny*. Upon this ground the good Saint recommended the devotion for the dead warmly to his subjects, and they to the people who frequented their Monasteries: and hence this Doctrin came to be common where his order was in esteem. And so, being a pious credulity stay'd about one hundred years till the School began. Which finding it very common, easily favour'd it with such reasons and explications as they thought fit, though not universally, for some are found to have contradicted it, and so it was exalted to a *probable opinion*. In which state the Council of *Florence* found it, and practis'd it, giving communion to the Grecks, (who as is before declar'd) left it out of their confession, after the Latins had put it in theirs. And in this quality it persever'd till my book *de medio statu* was turn'd into English. Then it began first to be a matter of faith, by the power of the great letters you put in the Edition of the Bull of *Benedictus*, and the Council of *Florence*. For, before that, even the consorts of your Tenet held it no otherwise then

for

for the common opinion of Divines.

---

# LAST DIVISION.

## Containing an Answer from Section the eighteenth, to Section the two and twentieth.

*The Catholick Rule of Faith defended. The Vindicators weakness in making the unlearned Judges of Controversy. His frequently mis-representing my Doctrin, and manifold failings in his new attempts from the Bull and Council.*

YOur eighteenth Section you begin with saying, *my Doctrin* (which is a close adhering to Tradition) *is the way to make fools stray.* You follow still the same truantly humour of using words without looking into the sence. For, if Tradition signify the delivery of the Doctrin preach't and taught by our forefathers, your pro-

position signifies that to follow what we are taught by our forefathers is the way to make fools go astray. Neither do I deny but that you speak consequently, if first you make the Popes veracity the veracity of the whole Church, and that all the Church but he can err, and consequently he may correct the Doctrin which was believ'd by the Church in the age immediatly going before him; then 'tis true that to prefer the Belief of the former age before the Popes word will *lead fools astray*. But for my part I desire to be one of those fools, and to go so astray. You run on in a full careere, and tell us of the Authority of the Church and Councils in common, and that things settled by them must not be brought in question, not seeing because you will not, that what the Church believ'd in the last Age is more the Church's decree, then what she speaks either by Pope or Council, unless she speaks the same that she believed the last Age: and so, you continue your discoursing with words, not taking their meaning along with you.

In your nineteenth Section you come so home as to judge and condemn me by mine own Doctrin, a great shame to me, I confess,

ſeſs, if you make it good. You argue therefore *what have we ſeen but Maſſes, Dirges, Almes, &c.* ſo far is almoſt true; but why did you not put in, *by which in expreſs terms we pray'd for the welfare of the Souls at the day of the General Judgment?* but you had reaſon to leave that out, for it would have ſet a ſhrewd puzzell in your Argument. We have *heard conſtantly* (ſay you) *that Souls are deliver'd out of Purgatory by theſe powerfull helps before the day of Judgment?* In this part you have mended your former faule, for there you ſayd too little to ſerve your purpoſe, if you had prov'd all you ſaid; and here you ſay more then can be prov'd to ſerve your purpoſe: do you mean that your way was preach't *conſtantly*, that is, as a certain and eſtabliſht Doctrin of faith? or that for *a long time* they preacht it as a *probable* truth? or, without engaging at all into the degree of its aſſuredneſs? but perhaps you proceed more nicely, ſince you onely ſaid you *heard it conſtantly*, not that it was *preach'd conſtantly*. For to ſay a thing *conſtantly*, imports that the ſpeaker teaches it to be *certain*, and it is not enough if *for a long time* he tells you it is *likely* to be ſo. Now ſo far as concerns the delivery of Souls from Purgatory by the potent means

you ſpeak of was ever *conſtantly taught*, but that the delivery ſhould be made before the day of Judgment, was taught but as a *pious opinion*, if the Preacher underſtood the ſence of the Doctours of the Schools themſelves, who add no ſuch qualification: becauſe, their principles being either Authority or Reaſon, they find in Authority neither Fathers, nor Councils, nor Popes expreſs in the point, and Reaſons much leſs favourable, and to ſay the truth though they are apt enough to diſpute whether there be a God, a Trinity, an Incarnation, *&c.* Yet I do not remember to have heard of any one who hath treated of this propoſition ſo directly as to diſpute it *pro* and *con.* Which being ſo, what certainty can we expect a Preacher ſhould fix upon this Doctrin.

But to declare what I think thoſe whom you appeal to will anſwer: I beleeve it is, that they never reflected to make any *difference* of the things the Preachers deliver'd them, and much leſs upon the *degrees of aſſent* they gave to this or that point, and as far as they can tell they gave the *ſame* aſſent to any place of Scripture the Preacher explicated, as they did to this point; unleſs ſome particular occaſion put them in mind

mind to qualify one and not the other. But, as they found by experience in other things that if any rub came to make them doubt of any thing a Preacher sayd, then first they began to consider on what grounds they were bound to believe the point proposed, so they have done in this, and of those who have spent any competent time in examining both sides, many have discover'd your grounds unsafe to build any certainty on, and some confest them too weak to sustain even so much as a probability. What the Gentleman, whose letter you cite (and with some imprudent circumstances) will say, why he was carryed away with your Arguments, I know not; but had he read my Books as much as I esteem his learning and vertue; he would surely have met with full answers to your very objections: which they who read yours cannot do; nor so much as hear of the Arguments I use to maintain my opinion; you on set purpose concealing them; and proposing, in their stead, as my whole grounds, a discourse made to a meer Philosopher or Heathen, where the method of a regular writer oblig'd me to *abstract* from Revelation.

But that this answer I set down is for

the greateſt part of thoſe that follow this opinion, a true one, is not onely manifeſt to all that reflect upon what paſſeth within them on the like occaſions, but experience hath taught me it in every country where I have converſed ſince the publiſhing this Doctrin. In all which I have found divers who upon hearing of it acknowledg'd that before they had in their hearts a certain diſlike of your opinion, but they knew not why; it having a kind of an uncouth ſemblance, yet they could not pitch upon any thing to ſay ſolidly againſt it. One paſſage I will intreat your patience to let me tell you: Before I printed it, I communicated this point to one of the greateſt Divines of Chriſtendome, and confeſt to be ſo. He preſently reply'd it was againſt the Council of *Florence*, and went immediately to his Chamber and fetcht down the Council; when we had a little debated the text, and he ſaw it did not reach home, he ſhut up the Book, with theſe words. *Look to it, you will draw all the Regulars upon your back*, meaning all ſuch of them, as found great profit by perſwading the people they ſhould procure a ſudden redemption of their friends out of Purgatory, which I believe, are thoſe you ſpeak of that *hear not*

*of this Doctrin without horrour.* Therefore, Acute Sir, you will or may see that your Argument is two edged, and as the Auditours you speak of did not distinguish the degree of assent to this position from that they give to Faith, so neither do they make any difference between it and the sleightest assent they have. Thus may your Adversary by your Argument conclude any practise of the Church, or common opinion of Preachers, or generally received Ecclesiastical storyes, nay even the new holy dayes to be points of faith, as well and as easily as you do this. What difference of assent, think you, do the People make between these truths, that there was a Saint *Philip* or Saint *Jacob*, and that there was a Saint *Bennet*, or Saint *Augustin*? they hear of these far oftner then of those, and seldom or never, of the severall degrees wherein they are recommended to their assents. Even the more prudent in many such points run currently on with an undistinguishing assent, till something jog their thoughts, and awaken them to look into the business, then they begin to make it a question, to examin and sift it, and at last to settle it in its true box of Catholick, or Theological or Historical faith,

or of some other inferiour assent.

You go on to perswade your Readers, that those who *accept* of this Doctrin do it chiefly through *comfortable apprehensions in lieu of great horrours before they were in, and because it eases their consciences from the inconvenient care of assisting their dead friends.* In the first, you manifestly shew you understand not the Doctrin of your own Divines; for, we agree in the grievousness of the punishments, or if we disagree in any thing, it is that mine is the severer. For the difference of our positions is not in what the punishments are, which we both agree to be *acts of the will*: Our difference is, whether these acts of the will be caused by the force of *nature* in spirits, as I say; or by the force of *material fire*, as your Divines maintain. Which was the cause why when I explicated the nature of Hell in a Divinity lecture, one of my Scholars told me, I made Hell worse then it was. For in truth the force of a material body is not to be compared to the strong activity of a subsistent spirit, as any Divine will easily guess.

In your other point you seem to have fram'd your conceit out of conversation with Women and Children, whose desires

are

are violent at the instant, but soon pass away; and not out of the consideration of men whose counsels are govern'd by a far prospect, and aym at perpetuity. So you flatter poor Women with the hopes of relieving their friends the first morning, or the first Saturday, or in some speedy time, and get present monies fit to make merry with for one day; never reflecting that the ancient and manly charity for the dead was to establish *Foundations*, and *perpetual Anniversaries*; by which the memory of our friends, and prayers for them was often renew'd, and long continu'd; whereas taking your Principles, we need neither much *fear the terrours of Purgatory*, nor seek new wayes to *ease our Consciences from the incumbent care of assisting our departed friends*, since one Mass at a privileg'd Altar will do the work alone, and a very little sum of money procure that Mass without going to the cost of Dirige's and such like chargable Offices. And here I must ask my Readers & my Adversary's leave to correct one suspition I had unawares entertain'd, that Interest might have some influence upon the Defenders of this short stay in Purgatory; I was deceiv'd, and now I see they are no wayes accusable of that odious

crime

crime: anciently great alms were given, and those often repeated, for the assistance of one Soul; and so the Church and Church men gain'd much, and grew rich apace: Now there is open'd a far cheaper way; one piece alone, and that of silver too, dispatches the business. Surely our fair and numerous and rich Monasteryes were not built and endow'd with such petty Contributions.

After this you proceed to the arraignment of me before my Bishop or a *Nuncius Apostolicus*. But there want two things to make your arraignment good: first that the people be inur'd to Tradition, and to prefer the received Faith of the Church before all other Doctrins. From the danger of which your Divines will secure me, while they teach the People that the Church when it is sayd to be infallible, signifies the Pope alone, that all the People may err, that General Councils have no strength till they be seal'd by the Pope, and so I shal have this help to appeal from them to the Pope, let my Doctrin be as opposit as it will to all that hath been hitherto the belief of the Christian world. The second thing that wants to the perfect arraignment is that you have not yet found out so

weak

weak a Bishop, that will believe a Doctrin sprung from uncertain Visions, foster'd by unlearned zeal, and strengthen'd with an Exposition of a Council or of a Popes Bull, against the rules of Grammar, Logick, and Divinity; is the belief of the present Church. In the mean while I give you great thanks both for your setting forth my plea against *Luther*, and honouring it with so high an approbation that it *thunders and lightens home*. For, besides that the knowledge of that form of proceeding against Hereticks is very necessary, it will give me a testimony that I am a good Christian, and if I be not a very beast I have not committed an errour to fall under so gross and so well fore-seen a Censure. To the charge it self, from what I have already said you may gather my clear and full Answer; that the Doctrin I sustain is not by me pretended *to be of faith* but onely *not against faith*: as also, that the doctrin I oppose, is not and Article of faith, and supported by *Fathers and Monuments of Antiquity and immemorable Customs*, but onely an *Opinion* not very ancient, nor ratify'd by the consent of Fathers, nor of so long a standing that it's beginning is not well enough known: perhaps, the later, yet

for

for its time as much prevailing doctrin of *privileg'd Altars* may live to be as old as this is now, and as common too; will it therfore deserve to be put into our Creed? or can it ever become an *Article of faith* which the whole Church professes is but an *Opinion* now? And are not these differences betwixt *Luthers* case and mine, whom you so charitably endevour to parallel, sufficient to distinguish our dooms? Examin them but once more, and I will make you my Judg. Onely forget not these words which your self put down as part of my method to convince an heretick; *That the Authority of things which we stand bound to believe, descends handed down from* CHRIST *our* B. SAVIOUR *and no otherwise, even till this age.*

In your twentieth Section you pretend to examin the Councill of *Florence* once more against me. Your first mistake is that it was *the business of the Council in Florence to declare the faith of the Church concerning the state of Souls which depart this life.* I mean not to speak to your History, for as much as was determin'd of Souls was agreed in *Ferrara*, but to the word *business*; for their business was onely to agree two points; one about

bout *material fire*: the other, about the *just Souls presently seeing God*, which was the business of *Benedictus* his Bull, and some of the Greeks were of the same apprehension with *John* the 22. But you like an Astronomer considering the phœnomena's of the Definition frame the question out of that, whereas all the rest was no *business*, but the compleating of the doctrin by dilating it out of tenets agreed without and before any controversy. Your next errour is, that whereas you pretend to compare my doctrin with the councils, you do it to the doctrin of the parts of the Council, when it is a clear case, the doctrin of *one part* is not the doctrin of the *Council*, but that in which the *whole Council* agrees. Your third Errour (if it be not a willfull æquivocation) is, that you say the Latins *believe* material Fire in Purgatory; which, if you mean by *belief, Catholick faith*, is extremely absurd; Since they joyn cõmunion with the Greeks, who profess the contrary; if you mean only they held it *as a probable opinion*, you cosen your Auditory, which expects you should speak of *Faith*, and not of that from which I may dissent by authority of the Council. Your fourth rather malice than mistakes is, that you impose upon me, that there is *no*

*purging*

*purging of Souls before reunion*; for all who know that *actio* is *prior termino* will allow a *purging* before a *being purged*, as going to *London* is before being there. Besides your oft repeated fault of mischarging me to hold that the Soules irregular affections are the torments of purgatory. Your fifth errour is, that you put an opposition betwixt the Latins and me where we perfectly agree in all, save onely that intruded word *by this Fire* which comes out of a former, and spoils the whole tenet of the Latins from being a matter of Faith, making it but a *probable opinion* in whole, though the other parts belong to faith. You add, *the Latins must needs have thrust* me *out of communion*, not reflecting that they gave communion to the Greeks who dissented in all you have alledged *truly* against mee. As to the Greeks. First you say I hold against them that Souls are in no place. And though I cannot affirm positively what the meaning of the Greeks was at the Council in this point; yet knowing their Fathers use, when they speak of spirits, to call *working* in a place, *being* in a place, I am well assur'd they would not thrust me out of their Society for denying a true locality in spirits. The second objection is answer'd

swer'd by my answer to the Latins, and the same is to be sayd to the third: Of your last objection concerning the efficacy of the helps, because you say you will evidence it, I must expect the fulfilling your promise, till then it is but a threatning likely to be of little effect.

You end with a great confidence that you have dispatch't this business, and converted your adversary, unless he will stand upon the *Errability of the Council*. For you (imagining your self inerrable in your rash and shallow interpretation of it) cannot (alas *good Christian!*) imagin any other possible way to maintain the conclusion: I on the other side, hope I have sayd somewhat that may help your imagination, but dare entertain no great apprehension that I shall *convert you*, knowing I have not spoken to the main foundation of your opinion, which is setled in your will, upon grounds beyond my removall.

Yet in the 21 Section you are forced to retire from your fair hopes, for your *great words* satisfy your adversary no more then your *Capital letters*. His answer in substance is, that you misconstrue the Pope and Council as it hath been declar'd by him and me before? And that the purgation before

the

the day of Judgment may be *suppos'd* but not *defin'd*. And clearly enough, such is both the Popes and the Council's meaning as is before more largely insisted on; which being the onely knot of the controversy, you do well to prepare loud clamours against it, and tell us it is a pitifull evasion. Let us then suppose it were *judg'd* by the Pope to be the *more probable* opinion amongst Divines that Souls were purg'd before the day of Judgment, though he held the other was also probable, which I think you will not say impossible for a Pope, since divers have gone that way in other matters. In this case was it fit the Pope should define what became of such Souls or no? if you say he could and should define, what is become of all your clamours against defining upon a supposition which afterwards may be found to be *impossible*? For he that judges an opinion onely probable, leaves a probability, that it is impossible to be true; since whoever sayes one side is *but probable* as far as concerns science sayes it *may be false*, for any thing he knows. Now, things that have a settled course in nature are so dispos'd that *impossibility* is concomitant to *falsity*, nor can it ever be prov'd to be *false* unless it be

prov'd

prov'd to be *impossible*. So that the Pope in defining *the coming to heaven of such Souls*, proceeds not consequently to his *opinion* if he do th not go upon a supposition that himself confesses may be impossible, and yet in all prudence he must define it as being but an extension of this his main question *whether Saints go immediatly to heaven*. If you say he could not or ought not to define such a conditionall case, who will or can believe you that hath any prudence since, for the position in self, He both thought it the more probable and saw it concern'd the most ample part of his division *of Saints going to heaven*. For all christians imagin more go to heaven through Purgatory, then either by the vertue of baptism or by eminency of Purity and Sanctity acquir'd in this world. So that I perswade my self you would easily allow the Pope not only could, but ought, in case he thought both sides probable, to proceed as he did in his definition. Now, that this was the Pope's case is absolutely certain and more then probable: since we cannot doubt but it was the case of the Latines in the Council of *Florence*, in which the Greeks by their leaving out the expression of some being deliver'd *sooner*, some *later*, directly way'd that po-

sition; and by consequence refused to profess an Article of faith, if this were one, and yet, without any repugnance or quarrelling about this circumstance, were admitted to communion and a common decree made in which the Latines position was abstracted from, as you may plainly see in the Council, and is before more fully declar'd.

Now as to your argument, every one can see 'tis weakly done to talk of actions proceeding out of knowledg or apprehension, not according to the *apprehension* but according as *things* really are: He that thinks two opinions probable takes both as possible whether they be or no. For, however they are in themselves, to him they appear so. Now to argue out of the nature of *things*, which he professes not to *know*, to the *actions* that must flow from his *apprehension*, is a clear inconsequence. Yet all your great clamours have no other ground, and therefore I think I may leave out your petty quarrells with your Adversary about his examples, as superfluous, and nothing conducing to the main point in controversy.

SECOND

# SECOND PART

*Refuting the Vindicator's other scatter'd Objections; chiefly those which oppose several Doctrins of the Author in other points.*

## FIRST DIVISION,

Containing an Answer from *Sect.* 22. to *Sect.* 27.

*The Vindicators unskilfulness in the nature of a Metaphor. The Triall of his Tenet and mine by Fathers and Liturgies. His Drolliſh Calumnies ſhown grounaleſs by the Authours Explication of his tenets about the Church's future proficiency in ſcience, a diſpoſſeſt Governour, and the uncertainty of the Scripture's Letter by meer tranſcribing. His manifold abuſes of the Authour in his citing him about Councils, and Hell. His miſcalling God's doing whats wiſeſt and beſt,* Pagan Fatality.

DEar Sir, (that I may, following your Directions though not your Exam-

ple, begin like a *Love-Letter*) by chance I had turn'd over a leaf too much, and so lighted on the beginning of your 22 Section: in which you design'd to *give a clearer view of my Doctrin*, and so I hop'd to have been quit of the former controversy, and could willingly upon that condition, have endur'd the bitter dissemblings wherewith you end this Chapter. But finding you fall back to the same quarrel again, I perceive you had condemn'd me to the Oar for another Caravan: And therefore I must repeat to you, that you talk so unskilfully of faith, as if there were none but in Popes Bulls, and Definitions of Councils: As if the Apostles had gone about preaching that such a Council had defin'd such an Article, and such a Pope the other. And so you ask a monstrous question. *How if some Imp of Hell should arise, and admit onely a Metaphorical and not a real Son* in Divinis, *how could this blasphemy be repress'd by* Consubstantialem Patri? A shrewd question I confess, for it so confounds the termes, that it is very hard to make sence of them. First, I would know what you mean by that terme *in Divinis*; Whether in the substance of God? or in Theology, or speaking of God? For if you speak

ſpeak of the Eſſence, the Arrians never held a Metaphorical ſon in the Eſſence of *God*, but in the Eſſence of *Chriſt*.

Nor do I think any who underſtand a *Modicum* of Divinity, can put ſo fooliſh a Poſition, that to be a *Son* ſhould be to be *God*, or the very *Eſſence* of God; and yet ſhould be ſo ſolely *Metaphorical* that it ſhould be *no reality*. But if you mean that there was no Son in God, but ſome creature, was call'd *Son* as the *Arrians* held, then what ſignifies this word *in Divinis?* rub over your old School-notions again a little, before you put your ſelf in print. Now againſt theſe was made the *Nicen* creed, and not againſt the former. But I muſt advertiſe you that by your high skill in Divinity, you ſhould have fram'd a new nature of *Metaphors*, to have come home to your poſition. For I doubt not, you can as well *ſquare Grammar* as *Philoſophy* to *Divinity*. Then, in our way, who look into nature to know what a *Metaphor* is, it appear's to be the uſe of a word in a ſecond ſence derived from a former. And ſo, how you jumble together *onely a metaphorical and not a reall Son*, I do not underſtand. For they have no more connexion then *green* and *doleful*, or what diſparate terms

you please to compound into strong nonsence? *Reality* speaks nature; *metaphorical*, a manner of speech, yet both these must be joyn'd to condemn some Trinobant to be an *Imp of Hell*. And why such fierce unchristian words; *Miscreant and Imp of Hell?* I remember indeed the furious zeal of a Pharisee let fly at our blessed Saviour, language far worse then this; but whether my Chider be Pharisee, or Publican, or both, or neither, I know not, God knows, and God forgive him, and bless me with grace to take patiently all his injuries, and I hope he will give me strength to refute his arguments.

But let us look into the thing it self, and seek how a *Son* is spoken of God. And, let our first question be, what those people who first brought the words of *Father* and *Son* into use mean't to explicate by them. And I know nothing, but that they mean't by *Father* a man, who by means of a Woman produc't a creature like to himself; by *Son*, a creature *thus* produc't. This then must be evidently the *first* signification of the words, and if another be attributed to them by *design*, not pure hazard, they must be acknowledg'd to be *translated* from this first signification to that next; as when he

he that converts one to faith or good life is call'd his *Father*, the person converted, his *Son*. Now, because *translations* are made upon divers kinds of connexions of the things signify'd, not all but such a one onely, as is translated for a *proportion* or likeness, is called a *Metaphor*, as a Governour or *Gubernator* in Latin, first signifies the Master or Pilot which governs a Ship, thence its translated by reason of similitude or proportion to him that in a City or Commonwealth behaves himself as the Master or Pilot doth in a Ship. Now, let us affirm something of God by this word *Father*, Will you say, the word was not translated to him from a former signification, but given him by pure hazard, without any respect to a fore-used sense? Sure either you or the Readers will not be so senceless. It remains then to see by what connexion it was translated. Certainly not that it was a cause or effect, or a concomitant, for all these are more improper, but because there is a similitude or proportion, seeing that in God, another Person proceeds in likeness to him, from him. Therefore a *Father* is spoken of God *metaphorically*. And if you but consider the language, you use by custom and not by understanding, you would

know it were *only metaphorically* spoken of God, that is to say in *no other* signification of the Word: not by a *Metonymie*, *Synecdoche*, or *Catachresis*, nor in the *first* signification: For these are the termes which are excluded when *onely* is added to *Metaphorically*: and not the terme *really*, which is a manner of *being* not of *speaking*, and so cannot be opposed to metaphorically, by one who understands the words he speaks. You will say you scorn these Grammatical Lectures, and I believe you; but such pride hath brought you to call the *principall* Fathers of the Church, and her best Divines, *Imps of Hell*, for all these say the same I do in this point. *You must* have some *miscreants* to accompany your *Imps*: Therefore you would have a *miscreant teach that a moderate affection to a Concubine, is a leſs crime then an immoderate love to a Wife*, and, because this latter is no breach of Gods *Commandments*, as your Discourse imports, therefore he must be a *miscreant* that should say it. O what want had *Solomon* of such a Ghostly Father? to tell him that *to love his Wives immoderately was no breach of the Commandments*, And that to love them so, as out of that love to fill *Hierusalem* with Idols and Idolatrous

Wor-

Worship, and not so far worse then a *moderate*, or rather an ordinary (for none is *moderate*, none but is sinful enough) love of a Concubine. Surely you have quite forgotten that excellent sentence of our Saviour, *He that hates not his Wife, can be none of his Disciple*; or, as it is exprest in another place, *he that loveth his Wife more then him*. For I have heard say, that by these words, is signified as much as *he that hates his Wife immoderately*. Surely he was no *miscreant*, that preach'd to men *to leave their Wives*, if they would not let them serve God quietly.

After this in your 12 Sect. you arm up your Fathers, and set St. *Austin* in front to make a great shew with his name. For in his words nothing is to be found for your purpose. And, indeed, it is an imprudence to cite him for your opinion, who professes expressly (*ad Dulcit. quæst.* 1.) the question had not yet been handled before his time, but might hereafter, but that he knew not whether rule would prove true. Yet you will give him a paper in his hand to hold forth, though it contains nothing but the profession of your Adversary. And not to take notice of the doubtfulness of the two latter Books you cite, there is nothing

thing in them that your Adversary will deny, but has already explicated them. But if you fail in Saint *Austin*, you will help it out by *Origen* who sayes too much for you, being known to speak heretically when he uses those phrases you cite out of him. For, his opinion was that *Purgatory* began *after the day of Judgment*, and the sentence given by Christ; according to which some were to be *longer*, some *shorter* in torments, but all to be freed at last. And this he expresses by the words you cite, and you should have brought some words by which it might appear he spake of Souls before the day of Judgment. But you have a salve against this, saying, *he wrote this before he was an Heretick*. By which it is clear you speak at randome, for he fell not to be an Heretick, by a set occasion, as some others did, but as long as he liv'd was accounted a great Doctor of the Church, and his Heresies not discover'd untill after his death, and even then defended to be none of his, but to have been soysted in by Hereticks.

Your next Author is *St. Gregory* of *Nyssa*, a man of very great worth and authority, of whom *Petavius* that famous Jesuit sayes, that some in his time, more piously

then

then either truly or wisely, strive to explicate some places of his which did savour of *Origenisme*. But *Germanus* Bishop of *Constantinople*, ancienter then *Photius*, defends this great man; yet not without admitting the *Origenists* had mingled some sentences of their own here and there in his works. Now this *Germanus* his Book is not extant, and therefore such places as use the *Origenists* phrases are suspected ones. Specially the Book you cite is excepted against. *Possevinus* rejects it absolutely, others object against it, that 'tis corrupted by the *Origenists* in divers other points, so that it is neither certain the book you cite is his, nor if it be, that it can carry authority, where the phrase is *Origenical*, as this word *Ignis Purgatorius* is, and avoided much by Greek Fathers, because it is so notorious in *Origen*. I have not the Book, and so I cannot speak expressly to the words. In conclusion, you make the Judgment of the Ages before those strange Revelations, which *Gregorius Dialogus* (as the Greeks call him, and say him to be the Pope whose successour was *Zacharias*, who lived about the midst of the eighth Age) hath left us, or rather *Odilo* who lived about six hundred years agoe, out of three Fathers; whereof

one

one sayes nothing special for your Doctrin, and is certainly against it. The second was notoriously an Heretick, and the words you cite pertinent to the explication of his Heresy. The third's words are certainly corrupted by the followers of the second, and the Book out of which you cite the place rejected by learned Catholicks, yet this you call the *consent of Fathers*, and the apprehension of those ages to which I appeal.

But now comes such an impiety as *should make a Christian sink for shame*, to wit, that I say *Virgils Purgatory is more rational then yours*. But what would you have me do, I did not know that all the light of Christianity consisted in certain private Revelations, *quarum nox conscia sola est*. Now that you have told me so, I will mend as soon as I shall believe you: mean while, till then, I may conceive a man of wit may conjecture or feign likelier things then we find in such visions, as go generally accompany'd with some circumstance against the nature of Christian life. Nor do I fear your exposition of the Councils will stand canonised in Christian Creeds, however you assume the confidence to nickname such shallow conceits of your own Catholick Faith all over your Book. You follow the same

same matter by citing places out of the publick Liturgies; of which all but one are purely indifferent to both parties, even in the very out side of the words; and that one easily explicable in a sence consistent with mine. You brave me to find out a new construction of *Ante diem rationis*, and I tell you I have found one of which I never heard before, and 'tis in your book, and in this very place, *pag.* 83. wherein striving to apply that excellent Hymn to your purpose, you mistake it I think as much as 'tis possible. First you make the Priest speak in the person of the *dead*, whereas the whole style of the Hymn runs clearly in the person of him that prayes, and in the singular; *Quid sum miser tunc dicturus, &c. supplicanti parce Deus. Contremisco, mei finis.* Wich which person suit these words best? that of the *dead*, or of the *Priest*? Secondly, your Argument must suppose him to pray for delivery from *Purgatory*; let's see how you hit it in this: *Ne perenni cremer igne*, can these words agree with *Purgatory*? Thirdly, you bring this passage to prove he asks Delivery *before the day of Judgment*. Sure, in this branch you will have better luck; and yet he that reads the Hymn but once unflubberingly over

(which

(which certainly you have often red over) will easily pick out another meaning from *Quando Judex est venturus, &c. cuncta stricte discussurus, &c. me, me perdas illa die.* Can there be possibly words more clearly contradictive of what you pretend? which yet is more confirm'd & made plain by the six last lines, where the Hymn begins to change its meeter, and then passes evidently from the Priest to the person pray'd for, *Huic ergo, &c. spare him*, whereas before it ran perpetually with *me*; and from *eternal fire* to the style us'd in praying for Souls in *Purgatory*. But perhaps you saw the Latin would not so well serve your passion, therefore you either find or make a Translation of it into English verse, and cite us three lines of it. Truly I do not take my self bound to answer such authorities, especially when they are grosly mistranslated with a foul corruption, of which I suspect you knew well enough; since the verses are printed in a late Book whose venerable Author you often converse with, and there they are, *my long black score, &c.* which you hastily if not maliciously change into *their long, &c.* Is this the performance of your promise in this very Section, to be *no Niggard to your Reader?* when you thus notably,

notably, in the Scotch phrase, *spare the truth.* Which indeed appears to mean in this Hymn, onely an expression of fear concerning the rigorous examination at the day of Judgment, with a desire to be handled there in mercy, else what an improbable request were it, to beg so solemnly one hour, nay, one minutes anticipation of delivery, for even thus much would satisfy (were yours the right interpretation) that moderate petition of *Ante diem rationis.* But because you will cry out upon Poetical expressions, though you use them your self and those lewdly corrupted: I will intreat you to apprehend, this Hymn or Sequence was put into the Mass, not composed expresly for it, as the Gospels, Epistles, and other parts of the Mass were: but was made for a Meditation upon the Judgment day. And so the true meaning of the words are, *before thou comest to count with me,* that is, *before my death.* The other citations are not worth the writing over, being common to both sides.

In the 23 Section, you begin to display your Rhetorick which I am very well contented with for two reasons. The chief, because It is fitter then Divinity to be made a bawble of, The other because a little patience

rience will be sufficient to answer as many leaves as you employ in it, that is some four whole Sections which I intend almost quite to leave out, they being made for disport and without proof of any thing save only of this, that you mightily affect the humor of talking without sence or reason. Yet I would desire you to note, that it is one thing to say this *is to be done*, another to say *I can do it*. True is it, I think demonstrations may be made in Divinity, but I have not even said of any particular point, that I have demonstrated it, (I leave that to the judgement of the Readers) Nay not so much as that I ever attempted it. In my two *Euclides*, I pretended to demonstrate, but so that I preferr'd not my self before greater demonstrators who had miss'd, and so I went with such care, considering that I also might err in some part. But, where I uted not the form of demonstration, as in my Institutions and other my little Books, I never went about to demonstrate. For those who know never so little concerning demonstration, know it is one thing to put a *medium* which bears with it a possibility to be framed into a demonstration, another, to frame the demonstration. The first is so common, that we cannot talk of our busi-

nes

nesse without using it, in case what we say be truly consequent. Much lesse can any solid Divine frame a long discourse without doing it. The latter, no body doth but he, that maketh it his proper task to proceed in form. Whence you may see how much you calumniate mee. Besides, you quite forget the qualifications I ad, in the places you cite by halves, out of my bookes; did you not read about the middle of *Ratio Operis* these words, *Si enim non potuisse rationem, &c.* to this sence, *If you say Reason could never have reach't these mysteries, I freely assent, but that after Revelation it cannot be satisfy'd I unwillingly believe, till it be prov'd?* Go on, and you shall immediately meet another omitted Qualification; That even assisted by Revelation we cannot penetrate into the Deity nor any Mystery, *thorowly*, that includes It. Then come the words, wherein my sentiment is plainly containd; *But these hinder not, that such Demonstration as is given of God may be found out even of these Mysteries*, that is, not thorowly or perfectly, but some Predicates and truths concerning them; which every Divine agrees of God, and I onely extend that kind of demonstrableness to other Articles. This I earnestly

intreat the Reader to observe, and when ever he meets with this accusation laid to my Charge, that I would *evacuate faith* by Demonstration, evidence, knowledge, &c. to understand me still with these qualifications: which had you fairly mention'd, they would have very much allayd the heat of your exceptions. But you cite me sometimes so interruptedly, and translate me sometimes so craftily, that I fear you rather affect to contend plausibly, then improve either your self, or me, or the world with any profitable truth. One passage here you very pardonably english to the worser sense, for the words indeed are easily mistakable; and they are these, *Sed hæc omnia, &c.* where I meant not, *Things* in your sence, that is, Mysteries of faith, expresst by these terms, expressing those Mysteries; but the *Termes* which *were taught us before Christ*. As appears, by my words, *Fides in humanâ nobis Idiomate tradita est, &c.* words not so far off but a shorter sight then yours might have seen them.

As for what you cite out of my letter to a Person of worth, that *Divines do not profess demonstration*; If you mean the *form* of Demonstration it is so plain there can be no question of it: If you mean onely that

they

they do not *evidently prove*; how can those Divines pretend it who think there is no certainty but in Faith? For the rest I say no such matter, but hold that both Saint *Thomas* and others have demonstrated many things, and that my self have followed them in such demonstrations. Another accusation is, that *I pretend to take away Faith in the Manhood of the Church*; which you should have prov'd. For though I conceive the *great Scholars* of that time shall have a large portion of Science, yet I do not know that I ever said the *People* should have it. The same I conceive hath ever been in the Church in a certain degree; Of which there are manifest signs in Saint *Denys* the *Areopagite*, Saint *Basil*, Saint *Gregory Nazianzen*, and others; as also in the Latin Church, specially in Saint *Austin*, *Boetius*, Saint *Anselm*, and others. But I conceive demonstration will be both in its *matter*, and in Divines much more diffus'd then it is yet. So that in the Church will ever march together *Science* and *Faith*, though in diverse measures.

Some other little nibblings at my Doctrin, (or rather at little bits of it snatcht from the Context; as your custom is, because taken entire 'tis too difficult for your

teeth) interlace your jollity in these your Sections of mirth and raillery. As that of a *dispossest Governour*; which you deform in the worst manner you can, by leaving out the Antecedents and Consequents, which would have let you see that my discourse proceeds in the case, that onely his own *private* interest or *particular* good be oppos'd and counter-ballanc't to the *publike*; not if the *publick good* be for his restorement: For then my whole Book favours him. Wherefore to make my Doctrin invidious against the Person you mean, you must first subsume that his reentry is against the common good, otherwise I say nothing against him; but all for him; and if you subsume this, I believe you will deserve no great thanks for your officious mistake, but approve your self his greatest enemy.

Next, you are hugely troubled that in *Rushworth's Dialogues* (which you say are mine) I make the *letter of the Scripture* so *uncertain*. And this objection I may conceive you borrow'd from *Doctor Hammond*, whose Book in which he has something against me, and (as I am told) this very passage, was extant long before yours; and I doubt not but you read very diligently

gently whatever oppoſes me. Unleſs perhaps good wits jump't in their obſervations, which alſo may be likely; for you agree much (taken as Scholars) in your *method* of ſeeking for Truth. I muſt profeſs therefore (to anſwer both in one) that you are two of the prettieſt men that ever I met with, and moſt hard to pleaſe with reaſon. Neither of you can endure I ſhould attempt & profeſs certainty and evidence in things capable of it, that is, in matters ſcientifical; nor yet profeſs uncertainty in matters not capable of certitude; as in our preſent point about the delivery of words by way of tranſcriptions of Copiſts or Scriveners relying upon their own human diligence, which 'tis impoſſible to ſecure againſt over-ſight; beſides divers other miſcarriages which the Fathers, as well as I, complain the Letter of the Scripture was lyable to. But to ſatisfie your tender Conſcience, and other Catholikes like yours; I profeſs that that place ſpeaks of the Letter of Scripture, as left to multitudes of human contingencies and imbecillities, and as taken abſtractedly from, and unaſſiſted by Tradition or the Churches living voice and practice, to guide ſecurely the delivery of it down-

wards: But I ever profess that this guidance of Tradition did efficaciously preserve the Letter untainted in all that was coincident with Christian Tradition, that is, in all points necessary to mankinds salvation; and not onely so, but so far the rest of the Scripture's Letter too, that nothing evidently contrary to the doctrin of Tradition or Christian Faith could light into it. So that Catholiks may with all security accept it and hold to it. And yet, notwithstanding the aid of tradition formerly, above 2000 faults were corrected in it by our late Pope's, since the beginning of the Council of Trent, and more still remain to be amended, as the Preface to the same Bible grants, nor is any person living able to shut us the ultimate compleating of the true copy. Thus much to you; How I can satisfy *Doctor Hammond* (who holds Tradition onely then when he can serve his turn of it, and otherwhiles impugns it) by what way in his grounds he can be certain of one tittle of it, I know not: and therefore must leave him to the Fruits of his Labour in impugning Tradition, that is to a perfect uncertainty of any thing that can concern his Faith. In a word, to a Catholik my position onely signifies that

we

we are beholding to the living voyce of the Church even for any Certainty of the true Copy of the Scripture; which, why it deserves more exception than Saint *Austins* noted saying of *Evangelio non crederem, &c.* I should be glad to learn. But you think *Rushworth* has made too *long a Catalogue of uncertainties.* To which I answer that if you please to scan the occasions of that long Catalogue, and then tell us how many we may safely abate. I shall in his behalf remain very much oblig'd to you: If not, 'tis plain you do not know we can abate any, or that his Catalogue is longer then it should be in his case.

After this you give a wipe at my denying the Popes *personall Infallibility*; and as for the point, you well know 'tis held but a *probable opinion*, and that many learned Authors hold the same opinion with me. As for my *censuring* it, I shall hope the reasons given for it in *Tabula Suffragiales* will stand to justify me, till something of greater force than clamour appears to overthrow them, that is, till it can be shown less than Archi-hereticall to say that an opinion which confessedly is no more but *probable* can be a sufficient ground to build Christian Faith upon. You

9. Your next piece of Gallantry is your old and oft repeated clamour of my denying the Infallibility of Councils, which forces me to lay open to the world how far your Malice is above your Conscience in writing against me. To do which I offer the Reader those few notes. First that you onely cite here three words, *non est impossible*, to prove confusedly that I deny all Authority of Councils, whereas in my *Tab. Suffrag. p.* 277. the place where it is found (which had you quoted the Reader might have rectify'd himself) it follows immediately, *ut Concilium tentet hoc facere, & tentando in errorem incidat, It is not impossible a Council should attempt This, and so err.* Now what this word *This* relates to is to be seen in the Paragraph immediately foregoing, to wit, to the making *new Articles of Faith*; so that I put Councils errable onely in such a matter that is in creating us a *new Faith*, you by maiming purposely my words make me hold them to have no Authority in any thing. Can this consist with honesty or fair dealing? Next is to be noted that in the same Discourse there which gives account of my Doctrin professedly concerning Councils, I maintain in express terms, that *Councils* are of *Infallible Au-*

*thority*

*thority in declaring Articles of Faith*, that the Pope *declaring ex cathedra concerning a matter of Faith is infallible*, and that the ſame is to be ſaid of *Generall and even Provinciall Councils, if they proceed duly in their diſcuſſion.* And muſt all this be conceald, and onely three generall words which declare neither particular manner nor matter be barely alleadg'd as a ground of all your ſpiteſull Rhetorick! How ſtrange a proceeding is this for a Chriſtian! My third note is that in caſe Chriſt be a perfect Law-giver, and that the Faith he left be *ſufficient* and no more *neceſſary* for the Church, that is, if a Council have nothing to do in making *new Articles* of Faith, then I onely deny Infallibility to Councils in things *unneceſſary* for the Church, and *unconcerning* their duty as Definers of Faith, and give them an *abſolute Inerrancy* in all points *neceſſary* for the Church, that is, in all that can truly concern their main purpoſe, that is, defining Faith. And more than this, I beleeve you will find an hundred Catholick Doctors to one, deny them as well as I. My fourth note ſhall be that you would make the denying Infallibility of Councils, abſtracting both from all matters and manners of proceeding

ceeding or acceptation of the Church (for so you treat it) my singular opinion, whereas thus spoken of, we have for their Errability amongst the *Franciscans Castillo*, and the learned Author of *Systema Fidei*, who cites him; for the Dominicans *Sotus*, who tells us that *if God by his secret judgment suffers a Council to err, he will not permit it long to be conceald from the Church, but will take order that it be corrected by another following Council before it be receiv'd in the Church.* For the Jesuits, *Bacon*, telling us *it was the opinion of Saint Austin, and of all the writers of that Age, that the resolution of Faith was compleated in the reception of the whole Christian world.* For the Fathers Saint *Austin* himself, whose known words are that *Plenary Councils have been corrected by following ones*, where he seems also to speak even of *matters of Faith.* Of Cardinalls, *Cusanus*, that *it may be observ'd by all experience that an universall Council may fail.* For your own Doctors, worthy Dean *Creffy*, in whom you may find most of these Authors cited, *Exomol. c.* 33. where he acknowledges the placing the Infallibility of Councils ultimately in the acceptation of the Church, *an opinion at least allowable*, and according to his eminent learning,

learning, and charity puts down the conveniences he observ'd in that Doctrin to the reducing the Heterodox party. Nor onely these, but indeed, who is there of any note that will say a Council is Infallible unless it proceed *Conciliariter*? and that it may not proceed *conciliarly*, or after the regular way of a Council, I believe you are not unacquainted: if you be, let Pope *Martin* the fifth teach it you, who in the last Session of the Council of Constance, declares himself to hold and observe their Decrees made *conciliariter, & non aliter nec alio modo*, and this too expresly *in matters of Faith*, which caution of his shows he held a possibility of their proceeding illegally. Now what they call *Conciliariter*, I call (in definitions of Faith) *attending to Tradition*: which put, I hold and maintain them absolutely Infallible; whereas I believe, all except me (if you examin the matter well, and report it candidly) put more numerous, and more difficult conditions to their Infallibility, and far more liable to contingency than what I require; which is both extremely hard to fail, and when it does, must needs be most notorious to the whole world, and so beyond my power to pretend or excuse it, as you would wisely per-

perſwade the Reader, by ſaying this Doctrin *brings all into my hands.*

So that we have eminently learned men of all the chief orders in Gods Church, Cardinalls, and Fathers (to omit many, or rather all others) directly of my opinion in holding a *Non eſt impoſſibile*, ſpeaking in generall; or rather I of theirs, and yet I onely muſt be raild at, as if none in the world held it or broacht it but I. Turn now, I beſeech you, valiant Sir, the mouth of your pot-gun againſt all theſe renowned Authors, and diſcharge your intemperate ſpleen againſt them as *abandoning the Catholick Church, denying the Authority of Councils*, and ſuch like, (which make up a great part of your worthy work) and ſee how feeble an attempt you will make, and whether you will not deſerve as great an hiſs, as you have made a noiſe to no purpoſe but to breath out ſome of your ſwelling paſſion. At leaſt excuſe your ſelf to charitable Chriſtians, why omitting to mention all others Authority who held the ſame Doctrin with mine, leaping over the backs of all diſtinctions both of matter and manner, without which your diſcourſe ſignifys nothing; and, laſtly, why leaving out words of mine within the ſame *commas* which

which should clear me, you rawly took out three onely which were generall ones, apply'd them to what particular sence you pleas'd, nay, extended them to that which was invidious, and which I never held, and by these arts abus'd the veneration which the vulgar justly have of Councils, to stir up in them an undeserved ill opinion against me. I pass by in my Book many such like carriages of yours; this, because you so often, and so maliciously glance at, I could not leave totally unreflected on.

If it would not spoil your sport, I would crave leave to right the reader in the conceit you would imprint in him of my *Romancicall Hell*, as you are pleas'd to term it; the ridiculousness of which lies in your expressions, not mine. One would think by your putting, *Dancers*, *Bowlers*, *Fencers*, &c. in other Letters, they were my words, but he would be mistaken. One would think that the words *attempting now in Hell in all their severall postures*, which signify'd as if they were playing tricks there, were my words or sence, but would be mistaken again. One would have thought you might have had the candor not to omit the word *quasi*, which would have spoild the exactness of the postures you fancy, and so have much

much qualify'd your jeſt; Laſtly, one that had not known you might have imagin'd you would have tranſcrib'd to the full point, and not ſtill take two or three words ſingle, and then you ſhould have ſeen the mixture of *deſperation, fear* and *grief*, marring the perfect molds your imagination had fram'd, and made me ſay no more but that the ſhapes of the damned were *frightfull* and *diſtracted*.

But (to omit other little advantages by which you ſtrive in the tranſlating 3 lines to render my ſence ridiculous) I would gladly know where you find theſe words ſpoken of damned *Souls*, as you would here perſwade us; I would gladly know where you find the word *now* which you put as mine [*attempting now in Hell*] whereas the whole Chapter is intitled & declares it ſelf in each Paragraph, to ſpeak of their *Bodyes* onely, not *Souls*; and this not *now*, but expreſly at the day of Judgment, or rather (if it could be) after it. Were ever three lines ſingled out from their fellows ſo abus'd, corrupted and falſify'd to make a little ſport! Acute Sir, when you have a mind to make merry hereafter, take heed your ſelf to ſober and judicious perſons who require and expect ſolidneſs and ſincerity from

from you, become not the best part of the scene; however to Gigglers, who examin nothing, but laugh at Mares-nests, found onely in your and their fancies, you pass for a very comicall and witty blade. But, as I value the judgment of one serious examiner above a thousand of such light-headed things, so it seems by your carriage through your whole Book, you intended such onely for your Readers; I hear they are your onely applauders, and that wiser persons, even those that perhaps set you on, seeing your passionate behaviour throughout the whole, will not hazard their own credits to commend your work before any man of prudence and moderation.

Your next exception is against my sayings that *the best happens to the damned that could happen, and that God himself had been worse had they been otherwise dealt with.* And this you confute very learnedly with loud exclamations, as *Pagan Fatality, Prodigious!* and what not, whereas indeed could you rightly open the opinion, however told rawly 'tis to a vulgar head subject to misapprehension, you would have found it to be the greatest honour of God, both in his own Attributes and in the Govern-

ment

ment of the world, which mankind esteems of. In his own Attributes, because it takes God to be essentially wise, even to the least circumstance; and that he would be worse if he did any thing otherwise then according to the Rule of Wisdom, and that Wisdom in all things is the Principle to his will. Whence follows that if it be better to let the damned be damned than not, he should not have done so wisely as he now does, if they had not been damned, and therefore had been less wise, that is, worse in himself. In his Government, because it declares that in that very operation in which Creatures seem to be worst handled, even there they have the greatest goods which were possible to them. This Answer of mine perhaps you may have seen given to another upon occasion of the same difficulty rais'd. Now to oppose this Doctrin, you must either say that God in the Government of the world does not behave himself most wisely, that is, does not what's most wise to do, or permits not what's most wise to permit, which if you do, I fear any Christian ear that hears you will abhor your blasphemy; or else you must say that to behave himself less wisely is not to be

worse

worſe in himſelf, which is nonſence; If you grant both theſe you fall into my *paganiſm*, as you call it. For if God does what's wiſeſt and beſt, and actually ſuch or ſuch a creature *be* damn'd, it follows 'tis wiſeſt and beſt to permit it; therefore to do otherwiſe had been to do leſs wiſely, that is to do worſe; and ſo, if nothing limited the goodneſs in that action but what was in himſelf, to *be worſe*. This you ſhould have reflected on and ſpoken to, and not ſtill think that to make a wide mouth over a point of Divinity is enough to confute it, without ever weighing, anſwering, or ſo much as mentioning the reaſons 'tis built on.

## SECOND DIVISION.

### Containing an Answer from Section the twenty seventh, to Section the thirtieth.

*The Identification of the Soul's affections with her self. The best corporeall pleasures most conducive to Beatitude. In what sence the Soul is not the same in the Body and out of it. Affections of Souls not retractable during their separation. Mis-informations of that grief the Author puts in Purgatory, rectify'd. Our Saviour's sufferings not prejudic't by this Doctrin.*

IN the twenty seventh Section you begin to speak like a man that aym'd at a meaning and proving, and was not content with pure flashes of words as in your former Sections: Therefore I must look to my self, especially since you threaten me both with designes of your own and of abler

*ster Pone* which will more largely confute my errours. And I must confess you frighten me, for I do not love to take paine. But the best remedy I can think of, is to hasten this petty answer to you, which peradventure may prevent some mistakes in others into which you are fall'n; and so shorten in part their and my labour; your first onset is to ask *how ridiculous a position it is to say the affections got in the body are not distinguish't from the Soul?* and your reason of doubting is because the soul *was* and *can be without them.* I give you this answer, 'Tis as ridiculous, as to say, that *Relation* is not distinguisht from its *subject*; That *Intension* and *remission* are not made by *adding one degree to another*; or that *Charity* is increast by a greater *radication in the subject*; That *Union* is not distinguisht from its *Terms*, or *Action* from the Agent and term, when it consists not in motion; and twenty such other position, which as I must not doubt but you have shew'd ridiculous in your Philosophy Papers; so because I have not seen them I must judge to be probable opinions in the sentiment of your *eminent learned men*, while so many maintain them in your Schools; and yet all the Arguments you bring, are commonly ur-

ged againſt all theſe opinions. The maſters whereof peradventure may be of the ſame Judgment with me, that the Soul is a creature in its Eſſence immutable, but mutable to a certain point; And, ſo, that other things may be joyn'd to, or ſever'd from her, whileſt ſhe remains perfectly the ſame, and neither better nor worſe if we reſpect preciſely her *Eſſence*. They who have a mind to know what I think in this point, may find it at large diſcours'd, in the Preface before the Latin Edition of Sir *Kenelm Digby's* Book, *de Immortalitate Animæ*.

Your next queſtion is, *how I can ſay* that ſinfull acts *are perfections; ſince the Soul is more perfect when ſhe is depriv'd of them.* Sir, my unwarineſs in this was, becauſe I had heard that ſin conſiſts formally in a *privation* or want of ſomething, and that all the *poſitive* act is good, and from God *as far as poſitive*, and ſo muſt be *perfective*, and in it ſelf ſome *perfection*. Now, to your Arguments I reply, that in create perfections many times a greater puts out the leſſer, as Science puts out Faith, Comprehenſion Hope, Innocence Repentance, *&c.* ſo doth the perfection of a vertuous act diſplace the imperfecter perfection which is in a bad action. Your

Your third Scruple is, that I say *the life most full of corporall pleasure is the fittest to attain eternall Beatitude.* And I cannot deny but I say so, and your self bring my reason, because the Body being made for the Soul it cannot be (regularly speaking) but what is truly best for the Body, is also best for the Soul. Peradventure you can pray better when you are sick then in health and ease, and the like is of study: My imperfection is such I cannot. And, if eating my meat with a good stomach gives me health and strength to study and pray, I think I do well to put vineger or some other sauce to my meat, which may make me eat what is fitting to perform those Actions strongly and perfectly. Neither do I understand that this is either against Saint *Paul*, or the Doctrin of Mortification prescrib'd according to Saint *Paul*, who tells us, he chastis'd his body and kept in slavery in order to attaining Heaven, lest (saith he) I become a reprobate; to which end all that use mortification discreetly employ it. I confess this Doctrin is against them who think God is pleas'd with a kind of sacrificing their bodies to his honour, without any commensuration to their own salvation, but meerly because

they apprehend they make God beholding to them for the great honour they did him; as heathen Priests were anciently, and are yet us'd to do in some Countries.

You say *this Doctrine befits only Epicurus his School, and the life of Hogs.* For *Epicurus*, the Eloquent *Gassendus* hath taken a great deal of pains to perswade the World you are in an Errour: And for *the life of Hogs*, unless you be better acquainted with it then a chast religious man should, I think you no fit Judg of the Comparison. But, whatever way you go, He tell you mine: which is, to think we *feel* or (as I may so speak) *see* no acts of our own immediately but *corporeal ones*, therefore those sensible pleasures, heats, violences of charity, which we read of in many Saints lives are *corporeal ones*, as appears by the very narrations, telling us of bones broken, those that were neer them warm'd, those that they preach'd to materially set on fire, and the like. Now, I say, there being such variety of corporeal pleasures, the understanding man chuses amongst them, what are fittest to breed in him those thoughts and desires which are the most efficacious dispositions of the Soul to Heaven: And these I hold the best and noblest, and which

make

make a man's life the pleasantest. Of these (speaking in abstract) are generally those that follow or accompany Charity and Science, but in practise those which be the Instruments to increase solid Charity proportion'd to the pitch of the Soul to be govern'd, which possibly is not capable as yet of so great acts as the Saints we spoke of. But there is none so low but if diligence and industry be not wanting, hath higher and greater pleasures then the Hogs which were your instructers to know what *corporeal pleasure* is. And I cannot but marvell much on what your thoughts were wandring, that whereas you cannot but have read in the lives of Saints, and eminent Contemplators of the excessive and ravishing delight which they *felt* (that is, which was even in their body too, and affected it) so as they have judg'd it to be inexpressible and above all contents and delights this world could afford; yet forgetting all these, your thoughts could onely pitch on those which *Hogs* feel, as the perfectest. Do you think a virtuous man has not a more solid, lasting and true corporeal pleasure in the calmness of his fancy, and the undisturb'd temper of his passions, than a vitious man, who for a dram of

delight which his mad phrenzy of paſſion gave him, and ſcarce left him underſtanding enough to know he had it, has whole pounds of bittereſt gall of diſcontent attending it, both in the perpetuall fight of his fancy and appetite againſt reaſon, and the diſtemperature of other naturall parts which vice muſt needs diſorder. Nay, why ſhould we not think the Saints who liv'd mortify'd, lives felt not as much corporeal pleaſure, taking the whole extent of their lives, as thoſe enormous livers who cloy'd their ſenſes with the ſurfet of them. We experience ſo high a difference in our pleaſure taken in meat when we are heartily hungry, in a warm fire when we are extremely pincht with cold, that we have good ground to think their deprivement of the degrees of the thing, is recompenc't by the degrees of the perfect ſence they have of what they admit of; which is by the rarity of it commended and receiv'd with as great a welcome as a neceſſity both naturall and rationall, that is, thoſe powers uncheck't in that action, could give it; All which amounts but to this, that a virtuous life is in all reſpects the pleaſanteſt to the whole man. If this ſatisfy you not, what think you of Health and Sickneſs? Is not

the

the former full of corporeall pleasure, the other of corporeal displeasure or pain? Can any thing be so agreeable to the Body as that, more disagreeable or unpleasant than this? Yet I beleeve neither your self nor any understanding Christian had a scruple he was in health, but gave God thanks for it as a great benefit.

This being so laid out, what have you to except why the pleasantest life is not the fittest to attain Heaven? You add, you *have a Scruple to translate this Doctrin*, and you justly may, to do it so raw and imperfectly, as to make a quite wrong apprehension in your Auditory of its being from what it is. But as you have a confidence *of your Readers vertue to abhor the Doctrin* as you set it down, so have I, that any hath heard of me will give no credit to your shameless calumny.

You begin your twenty eighth Section with my *frivolous concluding that corporall affections remain in the Soul after Separation.* And you seem to bring two Arguments to shew it. First, that *all these desires rise from the body*, which being taken away, they remain no longer in the Soul; you may as wisely perswade a man not to seal his Letter, because the impression coming from

from the seal, as soon as he puts that in his pocket, there would remain no more print in the Wax. No, sweet Sir, Our soul hath certain *Prints* of efficacious judgements, which though they begin from the *flesh*, yet sink into *her*, and become as it were Limbs of her. For, as beasts work by Legs and Arms, and Teeth, so our soul by her Judgements.

Your second Argument presses, that as it *will not concern the soul to see or hear*, so neither to have corporeal pleasures when she hath all fulness of knowledge, so that you would make the unpurg'd souls follow reason, and desire nothing but what is fit for them; that is, to be *totally purged*, and by consequence go *immediately* to Heaven, and all to be *Saints*, and that their works follow them not. At least, you think a *Scholar could endure no punishment, who had no other irregular desires but of knowledge. Qui est hic? & laudabimus eum*: but, putting the case (how impossible soever in the judgment of Christians, who hold grace necessary,) we must remember, he that hath much science, hath a better knowledge of his last end, how great it is, and seeing himself deprived of that, hath a larger share in the high part of damnation,

which

which is in the *pœna damni* then any other: But this you knew nothing of, nor care to consider, diverted by reflecting upon *an admirable non-sence* of mine. And; truly I do not wonder, that you who cannot understand that a thing may be changed in *relation*, or that water pow'd out of a square vessel into a round one, can change its figure, without taking away one company of little *Jacks of the Box*, and adding as many more, should conceive how a thing can be *substantially* chang'd, and yet remain the same *thing*. Neither do I intend to perswade you, onely I presume to open how the one case is consequent to the other. Which consists in this; that if a substance be *divisible* in the formal ingredients which make it a substance, then also is it *mutable* according to its substance. Now the Ingredients of substance in this pitiful way of Philosophizing, which *Aristotle* and St. *Thomas* have taught me, are called *Matter* and *Form*, and *Existence*. Whereof *Matter* and *Form* constitute the essence of the *individuum*, and if either be chang'd, the Individuum is chang'd: But it is not so of *Existence*. For some of your great Divines will tell you, that Christ's Humanity were the same individual Humanity

whether

whether it had a proper human Existence or the Divine. Now, that which we speak of the soul is somewhat less then this. For, we put the soul to continue the same existence, but to have it sometimes joyntly with the body, sometimes in her sole self; and, because Existence belongs to her *substance*, we say she is substantially chang'd, and yet remains the same. But to answer your difficulty formally, I pray remember that the notion of *ens* or a *thing* is *habens Existentiam*, or that which hath being. Now *habens Existentiam* may be understood two wayes; for one that hath *actually* Being; or, for one that hath an *aptitude* to Being. Now, if you take it in this latter sense, the soul is still the same, for in the body it is capable to have its existence without the body, and out of the body 'tis capable to have it with the body. But, in the former sence, in the body it hath it commonly with the body; when the Whole, not She, is that which hath Being; whereas out of the Body She, not the Whole, is that which hath being, and so in this sence, she is another thing out of the body then she was in it. There is your distinction, sweet Sir, with which I must intreat you to be content, since you will easily see your ar-

arguments or inconvenients, drawn from your mistake of the opinion, have no force against it; for we speak not of higher and lower degrees of *Esse* or *Anima ut sic*, but onely of composition in the individual degree.

In your 29 Section you fall upon a kind of rational question, whether an understanding creature *can wish what's impossible*, and you handle it as if you had never seen a man do against reason. Let my first question be, whether in all the explications you have heard of the fall of Angels, you find any but of some *impossible* object? some say they desir'd to be God; some the sight of God without due means; some a supreme Government of this World; some an hypostatical Union; none any thing but what depended of God, without whose pleasure they affected it. Therefore all put an absolute *impossibility* in the object, which made in the Angel a damned will. Are you better acquainted with human affairs? Did you never hear of Niggards that hang'd themselves because of some great loss they had receiv'd? Never of an ambitious Courtier, that took a grief and dy'd upon a disgrace offer'd him from his Prince? Did you never hear of a Lover

that

that made him self away, because he could not compass the enjoying of his Mistress? Our life is so full of such instances, that 'tis a wonder you could not reflect on them. Are not all these griefs for what men cannot help? And doth not a grief include a desire of the contrary?

But you reply these are *phrenetick* men, our disputation goes of souls *perfect in knowledg, whose understandings represent unto them the loathsomness, vileness, baseness, unworthiness, &c. of those objects*, and above all the *impossibility* which (as you say) *at once cuts off all the will's pursuit*: Thus you; but give me leave to tell you, all vicious desires are a kind of Phrensy's, there is no difference but of degrees in them; one hinders reason, the other masters it: and, besides, Wilfulness is as great or greater phrenzy then Passion. So that, though Passion be not in souls, Wilfulness is. And as Passion hinders all those fine considerations which you mention of the baseness and foulness, &c. so much more doth Wilfulness.

You reply again, that according to my Doctrin, the *affections remain in the soul in the same proportion which they have in the body*, out of which your adversary will gather

ther, that as they in the body conquer all good considerations, so they will in wicked souls out of the body. But you substitute that in this World they make no vast or considerable griefs, instancing that *the most glutttonous or luxurious man, when he is fortified, desires no more the same pleasure till his Body be fit again.* I wonder to hear one that lives (as the *French* call it) *en grand monde*, in all companies, talk so unexperiencedly of humane affairs. Look upon Lovers, look upon those that seek after monies, see whether their whole employments be not to think on their Mistresses, and gathering of Wealth? Remember how many have held envy and malice a greater torture then Artificers could invent. How doth *Tully* seem to compassionat himself for the torment of ambition? How pitiful a man was he when *Clodius* prevail'd against him? But the great melancholies and disastrous ends I spake of, make all this too plain to need many words. You conceit that in this Doctrin he that goes *out of the World in a great thirst, shall be tormented with the desire of drinking.* No Sir, but he that is never well but when his nose is at the tap, shall have that torment. For he loves drink and makes it his last end, The other

desires

desires it out of *need*, not out of *love*, and so the *need* being past, desires it no longer. At last you take notice of the *sordidness of Souls in separation, if they be troubled with such desires*. I confess it Sir. I do conceive damned Souls in the next world, and vitious ones in this to be baser far then beasts. I confess, all you say of the contempt of drunkenness and carnality (which you seem to take for the onely corporall pleasures) to be perfectly true, save onely your opinion of *Avicena*, who kill'd himself by the excess of lust.

Then you go on and teach me what I should have settled for the griefs of Purgatory. And to shew how apt a Scholar I am, and how ready to follow your admonitions, I present you with two short lines out of *Institutiones Sacræ*, where having concluded that those who dy'd in veniall affections towards corporall objects, were not worthy the sight of God, presently add *& per consequens cum illum (Deum) pro ultimo fine habeant, ex desiderio Ejus & pœnitentia negligentiæ suæ gravissimas pœnas sustinere*, *Tomi* 2. *lib.* 3. *Lect.* 10. which is exactly your full sence, and not very different from your words: wherefore I hope since I have prov'd an

obedi-

obedient Scholar to my power, you will inform those your friends who intend to write against me, that we are agreed in this point, and that it is a wrong to report I say of Purgatory that the Souls are tormented with the desires of corporall pleasures, much less that I place the wholenesse of Purgatory in the deprivement of those. And likewise that a further design was cause that this would not content me; for you see I put no other but in *Hell*.

You charge me further to say, that all external torments in Purgatory would be pure pleasures, because they were suffered out of an extreme desire to come to Heaven by a courage that yeelded nothing to the force of the torments which the sufferers see to be their onely way to felicity. I do not see any great difficulty in this to a sober Interpreter, that what an external Agent inflicts *is not* the grief, but breeds it, nor will it reach so far as to breed grief, if prevented still with a strong apprehension of an over-ballancing advantage to be gain'd by it; which yet does not hinder, but that such outward punishments are, in their nature, properly torments; and 'tis the extraordinary considerations of the benefits they bring, that can sweeten them

into pleasures; and, however, the want of Heaven must needs be cause of an excessive grief. You go on to object that this Doctrin changes all your pious Meditations on our SAVIOUR'S Passion. Be of good courage man, and let no other pretence divert you, but proceed constantly and faithfully every day in those holy Exercises; and I fear not, God will assist you to satisfy all those scruples and difficulty's, which seldom become unanswerable till we grow cold and negligent in performing our Meditations. Thus then you argue, Christ suffered with invincible courage, therefore all pains were pleasures to Him: I think you know there was in Christ two parts of his Soul, the *Rational* and the *Animal*. I do not know so much of the Souls of Purgatory. When you say then he suffered with an invincible courage, do you mean of both parts, or only of the rational? If you ask him, he will tell you, *Spiritus promptus est, Caro autem infirma.* If you reflect on his prayer in the Garden, you shall see when he speaks out of the motion of his *inferiour part*, how earnest he is against his passion, you shall see he did *pavere*, and *tædere*; I pray put these points into your Meditations, and you



will

will find room enough for pains, though the rational part was ſtill fixt upon a *fiat Voluntas tua.* And this our Saviour ſuffer'd becauſe he would. For the ſtrength of his Soul was ſo great, that he could have had pure pleaſures, but would not, that He might give us example, how to fix our *upper Souls* when we are not ſtrong enough to confirm the *lower part.*

L 2 THIRD

# THIRD DIVISION.

## Containing an Answer from Section thirtieth to Section thirty fifth.

*The Duration of pure Spirits freed from the mistakes of Fancy. The Identification of the Soul and Body maintaind by reason and Authority; and that this is requisit to the Souls change. The Vindicatours rude conceits of Angels. Unalterableness of pure Spirits provd from the Indivisibility of their actions, His false pretence that the Author injurd St.* Thomas.

IN the thirtieth Section you examin the *Duration of separated Souls.* And you readily advance a Conclusion that as it lyes I shal not deny, but onely beg leave to offer a distinction. For there being three parts, Angels, Souls, and their Operations, of which you pronounce, I distinguish upon your third or last branch of Operations, which

which Schollars divide into external and internal ones, in the external ones I agree with you, that they are measur'd by succession, and by succession of time, as being corporal motions: But for their internall acts of understanding and will, I hold of them as of the substances: Your Propositions so jumble them together, that I know not what you say separately of them, and what in complexion: but because I defend the same both singly and in complexion, it doth not much concern me.

But to proceed, you say, *it is incomparably false, that to coexist to a greater or lesser part of time, addi or diminishes nothing to them*: I ask, whether, that a greater or lesser time coexists to an Angel, makes any intrinsecal change in the Angel? I think you must be a little besides your Philosophy if you say it doth, since common sence teaches the pure passing of time doth nothing even to us, much less to spirits. My next question is, whether if there be no intrinsecal *change*, there can be any *addition* intrinsecally made? I think this also will appear a plain truth, unless the fear of the sequel force you to contradict evidence: For the inference will manifestly follow, that purely to coexist to more or less time,

(which is the same as that more or less time coexists to the Angel, for the variety and quantity of coexistency holds it self on the part of time) adds nothing to an Angel.

Now let us see your Arguments. Your first is drawn from God, in whose Closet you have been, and can perfectly tell what he can do, what not, and so you press, what if on a sodain God should make a new Angel, would his duration be as long as that of the former Angels, or separated spirits?

But Sir, I would advertise you, that when the speech is of an Action done, it is not enough to examin his Omnipotence, for that onely reaches to a possibility of the creature; but you must also consult with his Wisdom as well as with his Omnipotency: For example, if you first ask whether it was in Gods power to make, or not make the World, and finding it was, presently you would suppose; then, let him have made it and not made it, the permission would not be granted you. So likewise your assumption, that if there were no time at all, God could at his pleasure create and destroy a soul, would be deny'd you, or rather that God could have the pleasure to create and destroy a soul in that case,

case. And to shew your own consent in this point, mark your discourse; God could not do it in the same moment, therefore in two moments. Do you not see, as soon as you have deny'd time, you immediately put two moments, which cannot be without time. I pray remember St. *Austin*, St. *Thomas*, and others, answering the Heathens question, *Why God made not the World sooner*, say because *sooner* signifies in a former time, and that a former time, could not be, unless God had created it. Your other suppositions too of Gods creating and anihilating souls, proceed from an unworthy apprehension of Almighty God, as if he should make and destroy Spirits, onely to shew tricks, they having no more difficulty to be answer'd, then the plain instance of one Souls separation before anothers; and therefore is but the repetition of the same case.

But well, what must be said to St. *Peters* Soul and the Soul of St. *Teresa*, hath not St. *Peters* a greater duration then St. *Teresa's*? To this I answer, what is immediately looſed out of God Almighty's hand, hath no respect to time, but is created for eternity, as the World and the Angels are. But, what God doth by the mediation of crea-

tures, takes a tang from them, and so hath some savour of time from the very loose. Therefore Souls when they go out of their bodies, have a kind of individual difference from the causes and time by which they begin. This is a kind of a difference, when you compare one Soul to another, nothing if you compare the same Soul to it self. And out of this is taken that diversity of duration which is found in several Souls.

Your next Argument is from the time, as the Divines call it, of the *way* of Angels to bliss, where you ask, *who hath made evident that it could be done in one instant?* to which I have nothing to say, though there want not Divines who hold it; but that St. *Austin* hath made it evident, that neither position prejudices Christian Religion, and therefore 'tis lawful to hold either side, and so let Divines dispute it, for no Argument can be drawn from thence, why succession should be necessary in the intrinsecal operations of Angels.

Your third Argument consists of some expressions cited out of Scripture, to which I answer, if you bring any Texts of the *thoughts* of Angels, I shall yield, but if they be onely of *outward actions*, those are measur'd by time, as by twenty dayes, &c.

and

and so argue no special duration in the inward acts of Angels. Those cryes of the Martyrs under the Altar are so plainly Allegorical, that it were lost time to shew they signifie nothing of importance to our controversie.

In the 31 Section, you say *it is groundlesly assumed*, that the *Identification of the body and soul is required for the Action of a bodily Agent upon the soul*, and I cannot deny you have said it. But one that had spoken like a Philosopher, would have brought the seeming grounds on which it is built, and shew'd the vanity of them, and not oppos'd his bare *word* against anothers *reasons*. You ask, who ever fancy'd such an Identity betwixt the Body and Soul? I answer, no body, no more then they can fancy that parts are not *acta in continuo*. But as *Aristotle* and St. *Thomas* have rais'd their speculations above fancy, and *understood* this, and taught it their Scholars, so hath the Church done about this Identification of the Body and Soul, if the notion of *forma corporis* be rightly comprehended. Then you demand *who ever believ'd, our Souls in this life are truly and really our Bodies, and our Bodies our Souls?* No body Sir, that I know of, is so grosly senseless; and so I think

think you are at the end of your Arguments.

Now let us see your *belief*, which is, *that the Soul and Body, as two distinct parts, concur to the building up of one man, who is one, not by simplicity, nor Identification of the parts, but by substantial Union or composition.* O how gay a thing it is to speak words and not understand them? We say the same you do; and nothing more, if you would make your words good. For if there be a substantial Union, then there must be an *Unum substantialiter, or per se, or properly one.* And if there be a *truly one*, it is not *truly many*, that is not many *substances* or things. And if there be not truly *many substances* or things, the parts of this truly one, are not distinguish'd really into *things* which are actually, but formally into things that *may be made* of this one thing: which is, to have its part in *potentia.* Now if truly and really the thing be but one *thing*, all that is spoken of that thing signifies nothing but *that thing*, so that the man is *body* according to the signification of one word. Another word will signifie him as he is *Soul*, another as he hath the vertue of holding, and so he will be a *hand*; another as he hath the vertue of walking,

walking, and that will speak of him by the name of *foot*: and all this be but one thing, which we call *man*. Now Sir, this is a Catholick verity, defined by ancient Councils, in the Unity of a Person, that is, an individual substance or thing, against the *Nestorians*. The same was done in latter times under the notion of our souls being truly the *Form*, or giving the denomination of being a thing. Now the difference betwixt us is, that you examin the words by fancy, and we by understanding and discourse.

You add further, *it can never be evidenc'd that so much as a substantial union is necessary for a Soul to suffer from the Body.* For *who* (say you) *shall render it evident, that in the state of separation, by the omnipotent hand of God she may not be made passive by fire?* Sir, I am so confident of your abilities, that I believe you are able to shew, that God by his omnipotent hand cannot turn a separated Soul into wood, or straw, or some other combustible matter, by which she shall become *passive by fire*. And therefore your Divines use to speak more warily, when they say, God elevates the Action of the *fire*, not disposes the subject or *soul*. But this also,

so, he that can prove Fire is but a body, and his action either rarefaction, or locall motion, or some such other, may to such as carry sence along with their words, shew, that, seeing an action cannot be *elevated* unless it *be*, that is, Fire cannot burn *violently*, unless it *burn*; and that the Action of fire can have no place in a spirit, which it cannot divide or burn, neither may it be elevated to torment a separated soul.

Your 32 Section tells us, *it is a purely voluntary and false assertion, that separated Souls know all things perpetually and together.* And, as for the *falsity*, we may guess by your Arguments. But to say it is *voluntary*, you have no reason: since the proofs are set down in *Institutiones Peripatetica*, which I suppose you read (as all sober Adversaries do) before you went about to confute: Your Arguments are first, *Our Angel Guardians every day learn our Actions* what they be, as it were by seeing the *outward effects* of them. You speak this so confidently, that I may imagin you have talk'd with some of them, and they have told you so, and then who dares deny it? Otherwise I must confess I am hard of belief. But you ground it upon this, that

*Onely*

*Onely God in the search of the Hearts*, which although one might interpret to signifie the *invisibility of Hearts*, and find Texts of Scripture to that purpose, yet I go not that way, but tell you, when God is said to be the *knower of Hearts*, he is condistinguish'd onely to men, and if you will have the sence reach further, you must prove it. For it is against the principles your self use, to wit, that Angels know all our material motions of our phantasie, and sensitive appetit. Now if there be no act of the understanding without a fancy agreeing to it, Nor an act of will without a proportionate motion in the appetite, you will leave few actions unknowable to Angels. But *our Saviour* [say you] *tells us, Angels know not the day of Judgment*. And truly if he had not included himself in the same phrase, the place would have born a great shew, but since he that is to be the Judg, cannot be thought ignorant of what he is to do, I believe the meaning is, that none *makes* that day *known*, but onely the heavenly Father, whose proper day it is, in which he shall receive into his own hands the Kingdom which he had put in his Sons hands to be administred till that day, as being his right hand, and chief Instrument

of

of Government and supernatural motion. And this is a known Hebraism, for in the *Hebrew* the same Verb in one Voyce signifies to *know*, in another to *make known*, nor want we such instances in our own Language, To *learn* one a *Lesson*, and to teach one a *Lesson*, that is, to make him learn it, being the same signification. Your other place that *they rejoyce at the new conversion of a sinner*, wants one word to make it fit for your purpose, to wit, that they rejoyce *of new*, For if they rejoyce from the beginning, as God doth from all eternity, it will come but lamely to your design.

In your 33 Section, you go on with your questions, easie to ask, but long agoe resolved? but as to you, to little purpose, seeing you do not take the pains to understand the answers. As for the Arguments you bring out of Scripture, they are already answer'd in my *Institutiones sacræ*, but must be repeated, because you take no notice of them; yet so shortly that they may not be tedious to them who have read them. You object then that *the Dragon drew after him the third part of the Starrs*; but why this was not done in a moment, you bring not a word. You say also, this Doctrine

ſtrine that Angels cannot immediately act one upon the other, *deſtroyes their Converſation* for all eternity. Sure you mean their *Grayes-Inn* Walks, or *Spring Garden*, where they uſe to walk together and treat one another; or their Academies where they meet at Muſicks, or bring their Poems or diſcourſe of news, or ſome ſuch like entertainments. Are you not aſham'd to dream of ſuch follies in *pure Spirits*? learn of *Ariſtotle*, that man is a ſociable creature, but beaſts or pure ſpirits not: the one being below it, the other above it. But did not in the great Battel in Heaven one Angel work immediatly on another? Yes, but not by goſſiping and tampering one with another to diſpute or perſwade them into the conſpiracy, but by example, and by being the Objects one to another: As when one ſcandalizes another by ſinning in his ſight. But ſay you the *Indiviſibility of their Actus* which is the foundation of this Doctrin is unſound, ſince it *will never be evinced, that an act of a ſpirit cannot exiſt to a greater or leſſer part of time.* Sir, If you gave us ſecurity of your ſpirit of Propheſie, we would believe what you ſay of things to come; till then we will grant your Propoſition as it lies unwarily

couch'd

couch'd, but not as you mean it. For the Acts of one Spirit may be longer then those of another, as we said before of different Souls, but that is not your meaning, but that the same Spirit hath successive acts, one of more duration, another of less. And this you should have prophesy'd of, why the Argument of *Indivisibility* did not convince. For speaking of one onely Angel, either he is in some act or in none? If in none, either his nature with the pure force of his *Power*, (which the Schools call *Actus primus*) can burst into an *act*, or it cannot? If you say it can, then you must put a thing first *not to do*, after *to do* without any change, that is to be *not productive*, and *productive* of an Act, that is, two contradictories, without any variety. Put him now *in act*, either his Essence with this Act, abstracting from all other circumstances, is productive of a second act, or it is not? If it be not, then out of this Essence & this act abstracting from all accidents, he will never have a second. But if the Essence with this Act is productive of a second act, then as soon as he hath *this act*, he produces the *second*, that is both together (or else as we said before, the same thing without change will be productive and not productive, and

so

so of as many acts as follow in this first one of another, that is, all that be in an Angel by his own power, without external help or determination. So that the conclusion is, all such acts must be in the same moment altogether. Your answer is that *this is true of one act but not of all*. But you must shew that the Argument doth not convince as much of every one as of any one, or otherwise it is but your bare word against a convincing Reason, though you boldly term it *a grosse Errour*.

But you presse that I hold *all causes are first, and set as to all effects whatsoever from the very beginning to all future succession*. I pray distinguish the proposition you infer against me, from this other. *There is no effect but had a cause, and its cause had another cause, and so till the beginning of the world*. For if you mean no more then this, I must admit it, howsoever you will please to miscall it. If you have another meaning, when you teach it me, I shall tell you whether it be concurrent with my sentiment or no. As for your crying out that *'tis Pagan Fatality, that it destroyes the liberty of God, and the Contingency of all created things*, if of these three words (though I doubt not but you have talkt them over often enough) you understand any one, I

will yeeld you the honour of being my learned Maſter, and ſhall not contest with you in Divinity.

But in the mean while I muſt defend my ſelf from your aſſaults in your four and thirtieth Section, wherein you accuſe me that I fix upon *Chriſtianity and the Church an Ignorance of ſeparated ſubſtances*, meaning by theſe great words, thoſe that hold the probable opinion which you maintain: as alſo, a *moſt groſs abuſe* upon *the Angelicall St. Thomas*. My fault is, that I ſay the opinion of Souls being deliver'd before the day of Judgment *proceeded from the not following a Doctrin of St. Thomas, That in abſtracted Spirits there is no diſcourſe, or any manner of compoſition of knowledg*. Whence I infer, *there can be no falſity in them*. This is my poſition, of which you tell us, that *it importeth not to conſider whether the knowledg of Angels be by true diſcourſe, or only by virtuall*, to which, ſay you, ſuffices *a priority of cauſality*. But if a man ſhould tell you, that the *cauſality* you imagin cannot be without true time, then peradventure it would be neceſſary to diſpute, whether there be a true diſcourſe in Angels; and this is the very caſe. For, take away ſucceſſion, and all corporeall cauſes which depend on time are taken away. There remain

main then nothing but the spirituall qualities of the Angels to be causes, which neither are distinguished from one the other, nor from their subject, and so all notion of *Cause* and *Effect*, as they are propet to the Efficient, are quite taken away, and so there will not remain any discourse at all, but a pure cleer sight fram'd on them by their Creatour, in which I beleeve you will not say there is any Errour or can be. So that the whole question resteth upon this, whether there be *true discourse* or no.

Now how do you prove what you say is to the purpose? to wit, that it doth not follow out of this Doctrin of *St. Thomas* that there is no Errour in Angels? Your proof is because *St. Thomas* notwitstanding this Doctrin, acknowledges *Errours in Devils*. Good Sir, as long as you have been a Divine, did you ever hear that it was a gross injury to *St. Thomas*, to say some opinion of his was *not true*, or *not consequens* to another? Truly I desire not to do an injury to any, much less to my Reverenc'd Master, to whom, after God, I acknowledg it, if I know any thing either in Philosophy or Divinity. Yet I have no fear not to follow all his opinions, much

less not to make good all his *consequences*. And so, Sir, I hope I am rid of your objections out of *St. Thomas*. Onely because you often repeat, that to say every thing hath a cause to make it before it be, is an Epicurean, Lucretian, Pagan principle, *&c.* I must intreat you again to look to the sence of your words, and not to beat so carelesly the Ayre. If at any time you happen to dispute of Liberty, I will endeavour to shew you your Ignorance, but for vapouring words let others judge how far they become you.

You go on in the same strain to except against the comparison of an Embryoes designing the Child to be born, and mans life framing the Soul deliver'd into the next World. But what you dislike I cannot tell, you say it has no connexion with the immutability of the future state. The answer is, it was not brought to that purpose, but to open the Readers understanding to aym at, of what disposition the Soul is at her going out. But if the Antecedent reach home, you say 'tis a position destructive of all Christianity. But you say not to what it should reach, but fain something as if you imagin'd I would have the body of a Child never grow in strength or good

parts

parts. When I shall know what you aym at I may know what to answer. So we may leave you to conclude your Chapter with a high conceit of the Victories you have obtain'd.

## FOURTH DIVISION.
## Containing an Answer from Section the thirty fifth, to Section the fortieth.

*The Vindicators forgetfulness that Eternall Happiness was any Good at all. That Prayers for the dead in the Authours Doctrin manifoldly profit the Souls in Purgatory, and relieve them, even there. Charity asserted to be the immediate Disposition to Bliss. The Authours Doctrin consonant to the Councel of* Trent *in the points of Revulsion and Satisfaction. Diverse Squibs and Insincerities of the Vindicatour touch't at.*

THere follows your five and thirtieth Section in which you have after so

long a digreſſion, remember'd again the queſtion of Purgatory. And intend to ſhew that prayers for the dead are of no profit, if Souls go not to Heaven before the day of Judgment: An objection of every Gentlewoman, but I hope ſeeing you have come into the liſts as their Champion, you will ſet it high. And ſo you do, for ſcorning the lower waies of others, who preſs this difficulty, That the day of Judgment will come of it ſelf at the time appointed, and Then every one ſhal receive according to his deſerts, whether any prayers have been ſaid for them or no; you fly ſo high as to tell us, that though the prayers made for the dead impetrate eternal bliſs for thoſe in Purgatory, yet they are of no profit. Is not this a gallant attempt? What may be your Arms fit for ſo great an Atchievment? Why (ſay you) the duration of ſeparated Souls is (according to me) above time and comprehenſive of it, therefore it is but a moment whether bliſs ever come or never, therefore there is no profit in the prayers, though they bring bliſs, and this is the full import of your diſcourſe. Could a man have expected ſuch an Argument from a Logick Maſter? not to diſtinguiſh between Subſtance and an Accident?

Accident? yet undoubtedly, according to his ordinary phrase, *All Christianity is ruin'd* unless this consequence be good. You were assuredly in a great Metaphysicall rapture, when in the same short discourse you took two such hyper-Metaphysicall propositions, as that it was indifferent to have or not to have the greatest good God hath created for a Person, and that there could *actually* be an infinite Quantity or Time; I must confess they are both very fit for your sort of Learning, to bolt out words without looking into what they signify.

But because this is onely your private errour, and the World is to be contented too, which doth not apprehend any great benefit in hastning of Christ's coming; I must a little shew the good that the prayers of the faithfull do for the dead. Let us then consider that our chief Good is Heaven, and the perfect sight of God, at which we aym in all our actions and progresses, from the first basis of our inclination to the End of nature, even to the highest step of Charity from whence we immediately reach it; This depends on two created causes, The perfection of the World; and The perfection of the private Person, which

is to attain it. For God hath made the work of the World in so exact a method, that it shall happen to be wound up all in a day. St. *Paul* hath told us, he would not have the foregoers be perfected before the rest, the *Apocalyps* expresses the same. Therefore Christ taught us in his own Prayer, to say to his and our Father, *Thy Kingdom come*: Therefore he bad us, when we saw signs of the approaching Judgment, to lift up our Heads with *hope*, because our redemption was near. Therefore St. *Paul* calls the good Christians, *Those who love his coming*: Therefore in the *Apocalyps*, Christ shews himself as coming, and adds, *My Reward is with me.* Therefore in the end of the *Apocalyps* we read that importunate calling on him, *Come, and let him that hears, say, Come*: and this was the primitive devotion, to desire to be with Christ. Now, to conclude, he that by his Prayers effects the coming of the day of Judgment, as far as he doth that, so far he procures to his Friend the eternal Reward, the main good, the compleat satisfaction of the desires of Nature elevated by Grace.

The next consideration reaches to the particular good that accrews to the party pray'd for. For the understanding where-

of,

of, you are to remember the Doctrin of the Saints, that for our selves we are heard as often as we ask in due manner what is good for us; for our friends not so, but according as is suitable to the rest of Gods providence. Yet it is agreed, that many times such Prayers bring some advantage, even to the special party for whom they are made; but when and how Gods providence doth carry such graces, we know not, unless the effect prove visible. Now we pray for the change of the soul of our friend from misery to bliss; If he be incapacity to be helpd, without doubt our prayers are heard, but when, and in what degree, onely he knows who grants it, unless he hath reveal'd it. And, as when we pray for a living sinner, the effect of our prayers (if it be fit they should be heard) is, that circumstances are so cast, in respect of this prayer, that he lights into convenient dispositions to bring on his conversion; so our prayers for the dead, work, that in the Resurrection such grace is increas'd to the party pray'd for, as is fitting to be retributed to the prayers and affections devoutly powr'd out for him.

The third Consideration reaches even to the rendring less and more tolerable to them

them, those pains they suffer before the day of Judgment in Purgatory, which is, to *relieve* them there. To understand which, we are to consider, that the State of Purgatory differs from that of Hell, mainly in this; that this of Hell is ever accompany'd with the horrour of Despair; that of Purgatory, with the comfort of Hope to see God's divine face. Now all Hope of a future good, if it be rational, is grounded in knowing the strength and efficacy of the causes which are to effect and bring it; and the stronger causes appear to be layd in order to such an effect, the livelier and firmer is our Hope, and by consequence more vigorous and sweet the Comfort which springs from that hope thus erected: wherefore the suffering souls, by knowing that the releasment of all in generall, and each in particular, is procur'd by the prayers of the Church, the more, and the more fervent prayers they see powr'd out for them, the stronger hope and comfort they conceive. To apply then this to particulars, as the aym and hope and present comfort of each Soul, is its future eternal Happiness as best improovable to it, by the order of Causes laid by Gods Wisdom and Goodness; so the fore-knowledg that the

prayers of Friends will bring to each with proportionable advantage their due reward (as I expreſt it in my ſecond Conſideration) gives each ſoul anticipatedly *preſent* ſentiments even in Purgatory of Hope, Joy and Comforts for thoſe advantages their Friends Prayers ſhall procure them in the day of Judgment, which ſurely none that underſtand it can deny to be a very great *relief*.

The fourth conſideration extends this advantage of prayers for a particular Soul, even to the ſtate of Heaven it ſelf: which to explicate, we may remember the pious opinion commonly receiv'd, that S. *Francis*, S. *Benedict*, and other Saints in Heaven have new accidental Joyes there, for any good effect perform'd by the Order they founded, that is, for the arrivement of any good towards which they as Cauſes had any influence in this World: now, of all Goods imaginable, none is or can be comparable to the bringing of the Kingdom of Heaven or univerſal Bliſs (this being the But and End of all our wiſhes, and of all, both natural and ſupernatural motion, nay the onely aym of his Providence, who is Goodneſs it ſelf) moſt certainly then they who in this World layd means of ma-

ny

ny efficacious prayers for the dead and for themselves in particular, will (in my Doctrin) see themselves, and rejoyce in Heaven, to have been particularly influential towards that happiest and noblest effect of bringing that day; Add, that this will be gratefully acknowledg'd by the whole Court of Heaven, and they respected accordingly, which will cause almost infinit multiplications of the best accidental Joyes, which they who in this World neglected to use and procure this devotion, will deservedly want. Reflecting then this thought back upon a Soul in Purgatory, who has deserv'd by her carriage in this World, and taken order to be efficaciously pray'd for, that is, to have a particular share in bringing Christ's coming in Glory, she has antecedently even in Purgatory by foreknowledg of those accidental Joyes she shall futurely reap thereby, a sence of them at present, by meanes of the certain Hope to attain them, and thence in due measure a proportionable comfort, ease and *relief*, even in Purgatory. So that you see according to my Doctrin, both Essential Bliss, and best accidental Joyes in Heaven, and (from the foreknown efficacy of prayers to accomplish these) a present

comfort

comfort accrues to the Souls in that State, through our ſuffrages for them.

You will ſay theſe motives will not be efficacious enough to ſtir up the hearts of your penitents. I can anſwer nothing, but that I doubt they are not well inſtructed and exhorted. And that it is the Preachers duty to endeavour to ſtir up their hearts with ſolid Chriſtian truths, not by uncertainties guilded over with a ſhew of piety. For indeed, what is not true cannot be pious. When ſuch Inventions have taken a good effect I bleſs God, that ſhews his goodneſs as wel by weakneſs as by ſtrength. But to adviſe any man to teach or preach that, out of which he and the Church thorough him may be upbraided to cozen the credulous faithfull into falſe and prejudiciall confidences, and make them rely upon ſuch Doctrins and Practiſes as have no reality in them, I am not a fit Counſellour; I leave that to you who like it.

In your thirty ſixth Section you overreach'd me again, for by your beginning I perſwaded my ſelf I was come to a period of my pains, and that the reſt had been but perſonal quarrels, which I could eaſily have ſwallow'd, how bitterly ſoever prepar'd by your raſh and angry hand. But looking

a lit-

a little farther I perceiv'd I must tug again. And first, as for that question whether you had intention to wrong me in printing your Bull, I believe you had not because you say so, and that onely you pretended to make the Doctrin pass for an Article of faith, the contrary of which all the world knew to be maintain'd by me. Secondly, I must remember you that you do indeed and inexcusably wrong me, when you say I deny that *such Souls are receiv'd presently into Heaven*: if you mean by the word *such*, Souls *purg'd after separation*, 'tis no better then a cunning calumny, and would represent me as holding directly contrary to the Bull and Council. Whereas our dispute is whether Souls may be so purg'd out of their bodies before the day of Judgment; not, if they be so purg'd, whether they go to Heaven before that Day: this I agree to, and is of faith; that I deny, & is but an Opinion. Thirdly, you do not well justify your Friends for changing the Title from *Concerning the Vision of God & the Beatitude and Damnation of Souls*, to this shorter, but more generall one. *Concerning the State of departed Souls*: while your answer signifies onely that they are severall expressions for the same thing, which to a wary considerer will

will eaſily appear an artifice. Is it all one to contend about white and black, and about colours in general? No more is it all one to define concerning Beatitude and Damnation, and to define concerning a State which is neither of them both. Fourthly, you often up and down your Book brand me with *faithleſs Theology*. What do you mean? do not your Doctors generally agree that ſomthing in Religion is demonſtrable? are they all therefore preſently to be condemn'd as faithleſs? cannot your ſelf demonſtrate there's a God? and will you think your ſelf an Infidel for it. Or dare you tell the Ladyes that for your part you are not ſo ſilly as to *believe* there's a God, you know it, and that as for belief of ſuch things it belongs to the ſimple unlearned, not to Scolars. I hope in your next work you will proceed with more candor and manlineſs.

Your thirty ſeventh Section being ſpent in petty quarrels; though ſome lines in it be both falſe and malicious, yet I will let all paſs and go on to the thirty eighth Section where you rip up again the queſtion, whether the matter of the Decree be, that perfect charity carries ſeparated Souls immediately to Heaven. In which you

you tell us your Publisher is indifferent, and may yet chuse whether he will say that good Souls at their decease be wholly purg'd from all irrationall affections or no, in the first Instant. And this may perad-venture be true. But if I am not deceiv'd he will not say they are purg'd: For I am sure you would censure it deeply in me, if I should say that after this life there is any more disposing it self or meriting towards life eternal. But I must not be over confi-dent; you may have two censures in your breast, for the same saying in the mouth of different Persons. You ask, if *Charity brings a Soul immediately to Bliss: What then does* your Adversary *think of Lumen Gloriæ?* It is to me a hard question what he will think of it, for I see your great Di-vines cannot agree what to think of it. But I guess he may think, either Charity it self when perfect in a pure Spirit, is the *Light of Glory*, or causes it, as well as the Beatificall Vision. You press farther the perfection of Charity *in this life* doth not give the Beatificall Vision, therefore nei-ther in *abstracted Souls*. But, if I should ask you how you knew the Antecedent, you would be at a stop. I can hear it de-fended that *St. Benedict* had the clear sight of

of God, And I was at a Sermon in *Alcala* made to the whole University, in which the Preacher asserted our Lady had Beatifical Vision in the first Instant of her Conception, and prov'd it out of his Text, which was *Fundamenta ejus in montibus Sanctis. Fundamenta ejus* her conception, *in montibus Sanctis*, in the heighths or tops of Sanctity. Therefore *believing Divines* must take heed of denying as well as of saying. Besides I have read in *St. Thomas* and others, both more Ancient and more Modern, that there is a certain pitch of Charity to which when men arrive, God takes them out of this World. But however that stand, I think there is a large difference betwixt the Charity of pure Spirits and of men. So that the consequence may be true of one, and not of the other.

Farther on you mention some reasons of mine against *corporall punishing of Spirits*: but you knock them all on the head with a Canon of the Council of *Trent*. To understand the state of the question, it is not amiss to consider that a Sin, specially a notorious one, hath three effects or parts. One in the rational Soul, where it is a Judgment or resolution, or affection, that such

an Action is to be done: A second in the Appetite or Body, where it makes certain motions and their cauſes which bring a likelihood of falling into the ſame ſin. The third part is in the external action, where it brings in ſome diſorder, which is ſubject to propagate it ſelf farther into other ſubjects. The diſorderly Judgment and affection is that, which our School-men, when they ſpeak formally, call the *Sin*; and account the ſin remitted, when that is duly blotted out, whatever that ſignifies. But it is ſuppoſed to be done by *Contrition* and *Abſolution*. And although they admit this to be ſufficient to go to Heaven if one dyes, yet in a living man they with reaſon require that the other two parts or effects of ſin ſhould alſo be taken away; which is to be done by *Satisfaction*. So may the Reader underſtand what Satisfaction is required for.

Now let us ſee what you urge out of the Council. Firſt you object the Council teaches that *it is againſt the word of God to ſay that the fault is never remitted but that all the puniſhment is alſo forgiven*. And ſo you ſee by the diſcourſe above made that we ſay alſo. Secondly, the Council ſayes, that *it becomes the Divine clemency that ſins*

*ſhould*

*should not be pun'd without any* Satisfacti-
on: So we say also by the fore-made dis-
course. Thirdly, the Council charges
Priests *to impose Satisfaction so, that it be not*
*only in the regard of a new life, but also as*
*in revenge and chastisement of their past sins:*
which is clearly necessary for the mending
of the outward excesses brought in by the
sins: and so we say directly the same. You
press farther, that the Council says, *in*
*Baptism the whole paine are remitted*: And
if you speak in opposition to sins remitted
*in Penance*, the cause is clear. For the sins
committed *before Baptism* belong not to
the Churches Court. But if you speak in
regard of God Almighty, I fear it will re-
quire I should ask your Judgment of a
Case. Your Divines tell us, that he who
receives Baptisme *cum fictione*, receives
Baptism truly, yet if he dye immediately, I
suspect whether you will send him imme-
diately into Heaven, though neither the
Councils nor the Popes words make any
exception. I doubt then, when it is said,
*all paine are remitted in Baptism*, the Coun-
cils suppose, that Baptism is receiv'd with
that disposition which out of the property
of the Sacrament is due to it. Now, be-
cause your question is none of the intended

ones, but onely by the by, I need not give a more positive Answer to it, but leave it to your consideration.

It being by this clear, that your calumny of saying I deny Satisfaction is fictitious; I may go to your nine and thirtieth Section: where having translated a long discourse of mine, you learnedly ask in what mood and figure it is? imagining your Reader to have so little understanding as to think a Demonstrative discourse ought to be just one Syllogism. How favourable, or otherwise your translation is I examin not, since your chief aym is onely to make a little sport, which you seldom have the luck to do with the least degree of good manners. The Gentleman that translated the Book you mention, is a Person whom all that have the happiness of his acquaintance know to be compleatly civil and ingenious, and one who wants but the *name* (which you indeed have) to be every way accounted Religious; a name I confess very honourable, and which carryes with it a presumption of vertue; but I have seen some instances where I fear it went no further then a bare presumption. I did not say how faithfull, but how *favourable*, since every Scholar knows the difficulty of

rendring

rendring into significant and unbarbarous English, the terms of art used by the most abstemious School-men in their discourses both of Philosophy and Theology. All whom your rashness cares not to wound so it be thorough my sides. Yet this fair offer I make you, translate but your Dictates into smooth *Love-letter* English, and I will freely forgive you for my part all you have unhandsomly written in this whole Section.

---

N 3 LAST

## LAST DIVISION.

## Containing an Answer from Section fortieth, to the End.

*The Vindicators mistakes of what passes in the Soul at reunion. The efficacy of his sleightly grounded Devotions examin'd, on the by. His impotent malice in objecting Paganism. His many bogglings at Divinity-Explications, like to fright him out of his Faith, satisfy'd.*

IN your fortieth Section you are troubled that after the griefs of Purgatory the sight of Christ should change the imperfect Affections which are in Souls while they remain in Purgatory. So little do you understand the course of Nature, that precedent *motion* is quite of a different nature from the following *quiet*, which is the term of that motion. And, forgetting you had given leave to your publisher, to say

his

his Souls were purg'd in Purgatory; now you will have it the *faith of all Christians*, that there is *no acting for Bliss at the Resurrection.* By which if you mean *meriting*, 'tis nothing to the purpose; for 'tis but your own fiction to put merit at the Resurrection. But, if you mean there is no change towards Beatitude, you are not well instructed. Neither is it a wonder, that this is a *pleasure*, seeing it is the very taking possession of Bliss after the pains of Purgatory; or as Philosophers would term it the *Purgatorium esse*, which yet hinders not but what went before, and was their *purging* or purgation *in via* was painful enough. After this, to make your Comedy compleat, you will have a touch at Hell; which (God be thanked) for my ease, you will reserve to a *new discovery*. Yet you very heartily beg to know, why the *damned* Souls do not repent themselves at the day of Judgment, and become Saints? Which is a sign you understand not what you read, though you are able to put it in English. And that you conceive, this putting in the body again, makes the Soul not only fit to be perfected or totally fram'd to the proportion of her last end, but that she is return'd again into the state of this World's mutability, of

forgetting, working by abſtract notions, gaining new ſcience, *&c.* which are the proprieties of her changeable condition in this World. If you pleaſe to ſtudy to underſtand, what you intend to oppoſe, I ſhall be willing to contribute on my part what I can. In the mean while, (having already anſwer'd the other things you touch at in this Section) let me follow you in what you do underſtand.

In your 41 Section, you accuſe your Adverſary of ſcoffing at hallowed Grains, ſanctify'd Beads, *&c.* Which it ſeems you will not permit to be held *external devices*, (whatſoever your meaning is.) Nor *Utenſils of a thriving devotion*: which is a term of an indifferent ſignification, and there muſt be ſomewhat in you to make you wince at it. The next words of *deluding priviledges* I looke for, but could not find in this place; yet afterwards reading them in the Poſt-ſcript, I conceive by their nearneſs to *Quamcunq; voluerit*, that they glance at the too much confidence of ſuch a promiſe: ſo large, that were it true, (and Doctors ſay the value of Indulgences is to be taken as they ſound) I ſhould reckon it a great temptation to neglect wholly both all venial ſins, and all ſatisfaction for mor-

tall,

tall, in this life. The onely advantage that I know a priviledg'd Altar pretends, (if we may believe the words of the Priviledg it self) is to deliver a soul out of Purgatory, by saying Mass there. This Mass we have daily experience may be procur'd, to say truth, at no unreasonable rate. What need I then, according to these Principles, be much frighted at Purgatory, and those dreadful pains they so often preach to me, when all may be healed with a little wisely-bestow'd alms, if these men be as good as their words? But they say, 'tis advisable not to be too confident in one Mass, but to get more: and is there no suspicion incident to an advice so unnecessary, if the priviledg speak true? and, however, so convenient in all cases? Pray you tell me in your next Discovery, to how many Masses on our *common* Altars is one of your *Priviledg'd* Ones equivalent? to ten? then the Priviledg alone is equal to nine; then which I think a greater blasphemy can scarce be spoken. Perhaps you may reply, I hold you too severely to your word, and that by our promising a full Delivery, we mean onely to contribute extraordinarily towards it; but why do you give me your word, if I must not take it as it signifies? why

why do you not play fair, and tell me, that one Mass there, is something better then half two elsewhere? for at the end of the account, that's all your vast promises come to, for ought I see. Besides, may not all the other Altars, where the same great work is perform'd, justly complain, that you endeavour their impoverishment? other questions there are as easie to make, and as hard to answer: but of this enough, the Theam's too plentiful, and I am even weary with thinking on't.

Next you accuse your Adversary, that he sayes you think such things promote souls in *Holy desires*, though for my part, I think it is a great reason of the use of them, to make people be devout, when otherwise they would not. And for souls going to Heaven by them, if they take away the pains of Purgatory, with what face can you deny it? I remember a Doctor of Divinity, who having obtain'd a Scapular from the *Carmes*, and a priviledg from the *Jesuits* to be admitted a *Jesuit*, at the hour of his death, was as confident to go directly to Heaven, as if he had had a Patent for it under *Jesus Christs* own Hand. Why then are you so touchy, as if there could not be abuses in these

things? why cannot you be patient in this case, as well as the Church is content to admit some abuses to have crept even into the administration of the Sacraments.

Your last note I believe is quite mistaken, for I do not conceive your Adversary intended to make any comparisons; both because he does not specifie any particular man to whom he should be suppos'd to compare me, and because there is no occasion for it. But peradventure he would not have the good life of any man, be an Argument to bear down a contrary Doctrin. For my self, I profess no exemplarity. If my life be such as may not unbeseem my Calling, I have as much as I desire from men: neither do I see any reason, why any one should engage for me, *supra id quod videt in me*. I pray let not opinion-quarrels break into Personal dissentions. *Si invicem mordetis invicem consumemini.*

To the same uncharitable end, I fear, tends your often repetition of diminishing words to those persons who think well of me or my Doctrin, insisting especially on their small number: but I pray you tell me, how many you think have impartially and attentively read these few Books I have made? I believe, in proportion to them, it

is

is not a small number who profess to have met, in many points, with great satisfaction; nor do I expect they should in all, I may sometimes be mistaken my self, and there I desire none to follow me; others may sometimes be mistaken in me; and there, I am so far from being followed, that my obscurity (which I confess a defect) will not let me be found: Nor do I see so much cause to be troubled at the fewness, as to bless God for the qualities of those who profess to have found good in my writings, being Persons both ingenuous, and vertuous, and of such frank and unbyassed Principles, as well by their own inclination as the influence my way may have had upon them, that I am confident, they desire nothing more then to see my Doctrin thorowly examin'd, and speedily brought to a fair & impartial Tryal, by the sharpest Arguments that a pertinent opposer can make; and indeed they themselves have been the strongest, though not the fiercest Objectors I have met with. One reason possibly of this little number may be, that my Books have not as yet been long enough in the World to be fully perus'd by many: what time may produce God onely knowes, to whom I submit it.

But

But to return to my self and speak to what you dislike in me, you absolve me from being an *Heretick*, to make me a *Pagan*. Nor will I refuse to be what you shall please when you have explicated your self. But this not marking nor understanding your own words, makes all the misintelligence. You make me a *Pagan*, but such an one as acknowledges Christ, and every word and titule either of the Scripture, or any other Law of his. Such a *Pagan*, such a *Neutralist* was never heard of before. Will you have me give you an Instance? take this Buff and Canons which you cite, and put them to my self or your Adversary, and see whether we will either refuse to subscribe, or even swear to them. Then our *Paganism* lyes in this, that we do not think you have the right sence. And this is my *Paganism* thorough all things belonging to Christian Faith. You say *I agree only in words with the Church*; but, saying so, you say, *I agree in words*; and by consequence, the whole disagreement is about the *sence of the words*. In which controversy because I proceed out of Philosophy and reason, and you out of what Masters Dictate I know not, you leave a great prejudice that my explication is the more reasonable. Wherein

Wherein consists then my *Paganism*? Because I pretend to demonstrate what you think is not to be known but by Faith. Then if I do not pretend to demonstrate but onely profess that they are demonstrable, and exhort men to seek out the Demonstrations (which is the true case, and what you add is out of the fulness of your heart) why do I not hold all the Articles by Faith? and where is my *Paganism*? But suppose some great Scholar possibly or impossibly (as the Schools speak) should have the demonstration of the Articles of Faith, would he therefore be a *Pagan*? I sure you never thought what a *Pagan* signify'd when you spake so choleric a word. That peradventure might make him more then a man, or more then a Christian, as a Comprehension is, if it reach'd to Gods Essence, less it could not make him. Faith is not desirable for its Obscurity, but for its Certainty. We govern our lives by *knowing* the objects, not by the *defect* in the knowledge. Let a man see his way by the clear Sun, and sure he will be as able to walk in it as by the dimmer light of a Star.

But you complain *I reduce the mysteries of our faith to our narrow brains.* Sir, you are

are mistaken. It is the quite contrary; you should rather accuse me of endeavouring to dilate our brains to the capacity of the mysteries by the help of Faith. Why God cannot elevate our brains to understand what he hath deliver'd us to be understood, You have not yet declar'd to my capacity.

You say *when you are told Souls are not purg'd in the state of separation but at the resurrection, though the word remains, your Faith is gone.* I easily believe you speak from your mind, and that truly you apprehend the explication you frame to your self, is your Faith; and so, that as many Christians as fancy divers explications of the same Article have so many faiths, but by this way I see very few in the whole Church would be of the same faith, I pray consider a little that reflexion.

Nothing is more clear then your next Example. You say *you believe that Faith, Hope, and Charity are infused by the Holy Ghost into our Souls in Baptism.* A Pope and a generall Council too, declar'd that of two opinions of Divines, this was the *probabler*; and, by saying so, said this was not the *faith* of the Church, and yet if this be not true, your faith is gone.

Your

Your next Example is to the same purpose; that *supernatural qualities are of a different sorte then nature.* It is indeed *St. Thomas* his opinion, and a pure Scholastical one, not Universally receiv'd. Yet if this notion of *supernaturality* be lost, your faith is gone: Good Sir, take faster hold on it, and let not your faith slip away so easily from you. Again you *believe the mystery of the Trinity*, but if it depends as to its deducibleness on what is *Essential in God*, you doubt it is not your faith, though all Divines will tell you, all that is in God is *Essential*. If *St. Thomas* explicate the Unity and Plurality in God by the Unity of Action and Passion in motion, your faith is lost. But chiefly, if any *miscreant*, or *Imp of Hell* (as your Love-letter Compliment it) should say the names of *Father* and *Son* were derived to God from what we observe in natural Generation of living Creatures, which being a materiall thing can be no otherwise in God then by *Metaphor*, then your faith is different from those who explicate so, that is all the Divines I have either read or heard of, who universally agree in transferring *Aristotles* Definition of Generation to the blessed Trinity.

You

You go on and tell us you have hitherto believ'd that *God most freely and of his own goodness built this Universe, and that he is not necessarily ty'd to the order and course of Nature*: All this is well, but now you are taught that *God must contradict himself, if he act any thing against nature.* And what signifies this, but what is consequent to that? for if God be the builder of nature, He hath setled this order which we call nature, most freely, but yet he *hath done* it: and if he hath done it, he cannot undo it again, without undoing what he hath done? which in English is called contradicting himself. For one to contradict himself, is to change his mind or will, which it seems is your faith that God can do.

Another Article of your faith seems to be, that out of the *very series of nature, Judas* might have escaped being damn'd; whereas all Catholicks agree, that out of the pure *series* of Nature, St. *Peter* could not have scap'd being damn'd. At last your faith descends to *flyes*, and wheras peradventure if you had thought, should God have *had* the mind he *had not* formerly to make another fly, his resolution (that is his Essence) had not been the same it is now, your faith might have been the same with mine.

But by falling immediately upon the *sly*, you have quite lost your faith. And your conclusion comes to be the same with this, that if God ties himself to any thing, and so remains ty'd, he is become a *pagan Jupiter*. I confess this is not my faith. You march forward, telling us, *if God neither command nor forbid any thing, all morality is lost*. All this would be well, if you told us what you meant by *Command*; if no more then Commonwealths do, when they appoint rewards for them who do well, and punishments for malefactors, upon which morality consists, your faith may be the same that mine is. For so I profess, God commands not onely by setting rewards and punishments, but by denouncing them. But if you have a special notion of commands importing a meer will or humour to command without designing any benefit to the obeyer, then I cannot help your faith, though we agree in these words, *God forbids to steal, commands to honour him, &c.*

Then you begin to prognosticate how you will discover out of my works *a morality that Escobar never thought on*. And truly I hope you will, if you take pains to understand them. But, if you only use words,

and never look what they signifie, you will do good neither to your self nor others. To give an Essay of my Morality, you bring this position of mine, that *Another man is no otherwise to me, than a peece of Cloth or Wood, which I cut and shape after my will. Even though I do him harm, or seek to ruin him, I do him no wrong.* And you ask how this agrees with that Principle of Nature, that *we ought to do to others, as we would have them do to us.* I can onely say, if it doth not agree I was mistaken; for I brought it to shew the ground the second Poinciple had in nature, and my deduction is this. Reason teaches me to use Cloth like Cloth, and Wood like Wood, and consequently a *man* like a *man*, that is to think that fitting for him, I think to be fitting for my self, seeing a *man* is of the same nature with the Considerer.

Lastly you are afraid, if faith yield to evidence, our *notions must be chang'd*, and in that you are not much amiss. For I also conceive the notions of one who understands what he sayes, are different from the notions of him who doth not, and upon this subject, I will propose you a place of St. *Austin*, which seems to me very home to the purpose. 'Tis too long to copy out,

therefore I pray read the 26, 27, and 28 Chapters of the 12th Book of his Confessions, and specially reflect upon the divers sences or understandings which divers Christians have of the same places of Scripture, and I may say of the same delivery of Faith. The example in the end of the 27th, and the beginning of the 28th, is in a manner our very case. There are two understandings of the Creation of the World; one weak, the other strong, both necessary for divers sorts of people. If the weak man when he hears the more intelligent explicate his faith, should cry him down for a *Pagan*, as taking away faith, it were no wonder. For so we read of a good Monk that had been an *Anthropomorphite*, who when he was taught that God was a Spirit: that is, had no hands, feet, face, *&c.* as he before had fancy'd him, cry'd out, *he had lost his God*, and perhaps, was likely enough to call him a *Pagan* too, that deny'd God such a shape, and explicated to him, according to the nature of a Spirit and like a Scholar, those places of Scripture which begot and so suted to that fancy of his; But no Scholar would judg him a great Divine for doing so. If you read these latter Books of St. *Austins*

Con-

Confessions you shall find that by natural knowledg he directed his understanding of Scripture and Faith, and consequently was as very a *Pagan* as my self. And so did all the Fathers by *reason* convince Hereticks *follyes*, when they could, and this is the duty of a Scholar, which Saint *Peter* preaches to us, and Saint *Paul* told us he practised *among the Perfect*, giving to weaker stomacks Milk, and not strong Meat.

By this, Sir, you easily perceive my principal aym, to wit, what I have learned by Faith and Tradition the same to understand and defend by the help of Sciences; which I think I cannot do, unless I first understand the Sciences themselves, and not frame the Sciences to Faith before we understand what Faith it self teaches us. How ridiculous is it that what apprehensions we made of our Creed when we were Children, the same we should retain when we are men. Or what Conceptions clowns frame to themselves in Religion, Philosophers and Divines should be oblig'd not to transcend, under pain of being esteem'd *Supplanters of Christ and his Doctrin*, *Evacuaters of Faith*, *Miscreants*, and I know not how many other such ill-favoured names as you

you give me too often up and down your Book. Think but how contrary 'tis to mans Nature, and the profession of the Church, to forbid Learning? to hinder men from searching the true Meaning of Gods word? from endeavouring to come to Demonstration as near as we can? to cut off all hopes of Certainty? and confound all Sciences into a Chaos of probability? Good Sir, since God hath created us to *Science*, and set our Bliss in the *knowledg* of himself, since he hath given us a strong inclination to it, do not seek to plunge us into a despair of it, and confine us to the eternal darkness of knowing nothing. If your self be discouraged, hinder not others to endeavour. Should six persons find out but six conclusions, there's so far advanc'd: those six may each of them produce six more; and so go on with an unbounded improvement; whose multiplying fruitfulness as we cannot conjecture, so surely we ought not either to envy or obstruct.

*IN your Postscript where you promise to make all such things good as depend on matter of fact, before any Person of Honour. I understand not well your meaning by this word* matter of fact. *But*

if

if false citations go under that name. I pray clear your self of this imputation I charge you with, that you say I put the pains of Purgatory to be the irregular affections to worldly things. A proposition you have so often repeated and urged, that you cannot deny it to be deliberately and examinedly done; So false and injurious, that you cannot refuse to acquit your self if you be indeed Innocent.

And for a Close give me leave against your next Vindication, to offer you this note; not as a Rule (for who made me your Superiour, that I should flatter my self with thinking you would perhaps obey me?) but as a friendly intreaty, that since we have experience enough of your power in Rhetorick, you would wholy apply your self to solid and usefull reason; This if you deny, at least let me prevail with you to put at the beginning and end of those periods where you intend to be bitter, some visible mark; that I may save the labour of reading stuff so unsuitable both to you and me; as also, that some other of your Readers, whose ears delight in such janglings, may directly pick out the parts that most agree with them, and not be diverted by your other less impertinent discourses: whereas in your last work all is so jumbled together and closely woven quite through the whole piece, that for

*my part I can scarce distinguish the* strong sence *from the blustring* Satyr. *If you intend to write like a Man and like a Scholar, take some Treatise or Book of mine and wayes; then show either the Principles weak, or the Consequences slack; else every one knows that in Discourses single Paragraphs subsist by their fellows; and so, to impugn such taken apart signifies nothing.*

---

**FINIS.**